Barcode : 99999990290419
Title - The Princess Of Wales Sarasvati Bhavana Studies Vol-VII
Author - Kaviraja,Gopi Natha
Language - english
Pages - 203
Publication Year - 1929
Barcode EAN.UCC-13
9 999999 029041

BIHAR
S N
LIBRARY

THE
PRINCESS OF WALES SARASVATI BHAVANA STUDIES

EDITED BY

GOPĪ NATHA KAVIRAJA

Vol VII

Printed by Rameshwar Pathak, at the Tara Printing Works, Benares and published under the authority of the Government of the United Provinces by the Superintendent of the Government Press Allahabad

---

GOVERNMENT SANSKRIT LIBRARY,
BENARES

1929

CONTENTS

Papers Pages.

I. Bhāmaha and his Kāvyālankāra: By Batuk Nath Sarma and Baldeva Upādhyāya 1—70

II Some Variants in the readings of the Vaiśesika Sutras: By Gopinath Kaviraj 71—76

III History and Bibliography of Nyāya Vaiśesika Literature: By Gopinath Kaviraj 77—89

IV. An attempt to arrive at the Correct Meaning of some obscure Vedic words By Sitaram Joshi 91—96

V A Comparison of the Contents of the Rigveda-, Vājasaneyi, Taittiriya, and Atharvaveda (Caturadhyayikā) Prātiśākhyas: By Mangal Deva Shastri 97—108

VI An Index to the Rāmāyana, By Manmatha Nath Ray 109—140

VII An Index to Śabara's Bhasya: By the Late Col J A Jacob 141—166

VIII. Gleanings from the Tantras By Gopinath Kaviraj 167—175

IX. The Date of Madhusudan Sarasvati By Gopinath Kaviraj 177—182

X. Descriptive Notes on Sanskrit Manuscript: By Gopinath Kaviraj 183—192

XI. A Note on the meaning of the term 'Parardha': By Umesh Misra 193—198

THE PRINCESS OF WALES SARASVATI BHAVANA TEXTS

Edited by

GOPINATH KAVIRAJ, M. A.

No. 1—The Kiraṇāvali Bhāskara, a Commentary on Udayana's Kiraṇāvalī, Dravya section, by Padmanābha Miśra.
Edited with Introduction and Index, by Gopīnātha Kavirāj, M.A.

No. 2—The Advaita Chintāmani, by Rangoji Bhaṭṭa, Ed. with Introduction etc. by Nārāyaṇa Śāstrī Khiste Sāhityāchārya.

No. 3—The Vedānta Kalpalatikā, by Madhusūdana Sarasvatī. Ed. with Introduction etc. by Rāmājña Pāṇḍeya Vyākaraṇāchārya.

No. 4—The Kusumāñjali Bodhanī, a Commentary on Udayana's Theistic Tract Nyāya Kusumāñjali, by Varadaraja. Ed. with Introduction etc. by Gopināth Kavirāj, M.A.

No. 5—The Rasasāra, a Commentary on Udayana's Kiraṇāvalī, Guṇa Section, by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Gopināth Kavirāj, M. A.

No. 6—(Part I)—The Bhāvanā Viveka by Maṇḍana Miśra, with a Commentary by Bhaṭṭa Umbeka.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by M. M. Gangānātha Jhā, M. A., D Litt

No. 6 (Part II)—Ditto Ditto

No. 7 (Part I)—Yoginīhṛdaya dīpikā, by Amṛtānanda Nātha, being a Commentary on Yoginīhṛdaya, a part of Vāmakeśvara Tantra.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Gopīnāth Kavirāj, M. A.

No. 7—(Part II) Ditto Ditto

No. 8—The Kāvyaḍākinī, by Gaṅgānanda Kavindra.
Ed. with Introduction etc. by Jagannātha Śāstrī Hoshing Sāhityopādhyāya.

No. 9 (Part I)—The Bhakti Chandrikā, a Commentary on Śāṇḍilya's Bhaktisūtras, by Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha.

No 10 (Part I)—The Siddhāntaratna by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣana Ed with a Prefatory Note by Gopināth Kavirāj, M. A

No 10—(Part II) Ditto Ditto

No 11—The Śri Vidyā Ratna Sūtras, by Gauḍapāda, with a Commentary dy Śankarāraṇya
Ed with Introduction etc by Nārayana Śāstri Khiste Sāhityāchārya

No 12—The Rasapradipa, by Prabhākara Bhaṭṭa
Ed with Introduction etc, by Nārāyaṇa Śāstri Khiste Sāhityācharya

No 13—The Siddhasiddhānta Saṅgraha by Balabhadra
Ed with Introduction by Gopinath Kavirāj, M A

No 14—The Triveṇikā, by Āsadhara Bhaṭṭa
Ed with Introduction by Baṭukanath Śarmā Sāhityopadhyāya, M A and Jagannatha Śāstri Hoshing Sāhityopādhyaya

No 15—(Part I)—The Tripurārahasya
Ed with a Perfatory Note by Gopināth Kavirāj, M A

No 15—(Part II) Ditto Ditto

No 15—(Part III) Ditto Ditto

No 16—The Kavya Vilāsa, by Chiranjiva Bhaṭṭacharya
Ed with Introduction etc by Baṭukanātha Śarma Sāhityopadhyaya, M A and Jagannātha Śastrī Hoshing Sahityopadhyāya

No 17—The Nyaya Kalikā, by Bhaṭṭa Jayanta
Ed with Introduction by M M Gaṅgānatha Jha, M A, D Litt

No 18—(Part I)—The Gorakṣa Siddhanta Sangraha
Ed with a Prefatory Note by Gopinath Kaviraj M A

No 19—(Part I)—The Prakṛta Prakaśa by Vararuchi with the Prakṛta Sañjivani by Vasantarāja and the Subodhini by Sadānanda
Ed with Introduction etc by Batuk Nath Śarma, M A and Baladeva Upādhyāya, M A

No 19—(Part II)— Ditto Ditto

No 20—The Mansatattvaviveka by Viśvanatha Nyāyapañchanana Ed with Introduction by Jagannatha Śastri Hoshing

No 21—(Part I) The Nyaya Siddhanta Mala by Jayaram Nyayapanchanana Bhattâcharya
Ed with Introduction etc. by Mangala Deva Sastri, M A, D Phil

No 21—(Part II) Ditto Ditto

No 22—The Dharmânubandhi Sloka Chaturdasi, by Sri Sesa Krsna, with a Com by Râma Pandit
Ed with Introduction etc by Nârayana *Sâstri Khiste Sâhityâchârya*

No 23—Navaratna pradipa, by Nanda Pandita Dharmâdhikâri Ed with Introduction etc by Vaijanâth Sastri Varakale Dharmasastra Sastri

No 24—Sri Râma tâpiniyopanisad with the Com called Râma Râsikâ in Purvatâpini and Anandanidhi in Uttaratâpini by Ânanda Vana
Ed with Introduction etc by Anantarâma Sâstri Vetâla Sahityopâdhyâya

No 25—Sapindya Kalpalatikâ by Sadâsiva Deva *alias* Apadeva with the Com of Narâyana Deva
Ed with Introduction etc by Jagannâtha Sâstr Hoshing Sahityopâdhyâya

No 26—Mrgankalekha Natika by Visvanatha Deva Kavi Edited with Introduction etc by Narayan Sastri Khiste Sahityacharya, Asst Librarian, Government Sanskrit Library Benares

THE PRINCESS OF WALES SARASVATI BHAVANA STUDIES.

Edited by

GOPINATH KAVIRAJ, M.A.

Vol. I—

(a) Studies in Hindu Law (1): its evolution, by Ganganātha Jhā.

(b) The Viewpoint of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Philosophy, by Gopinath Kaviraj.

(c) Nirmāna Kāya, by Gopināth Kavirāj.

Vol. II—

(a) Paraśurāma Miśra ALIAS Vānī Rasāla Rāya, by Gopināth Kavirāj

(b) Index to Śabara's Bhāṣya by the late Col. G A Jacob

(c) Studies in Hindu Law (2):—its sources, by Gaṅganath Jhā.

(d) A new Bhakti Sūtra, by Gopināth Kavirāj

(e) The System of Chakras according to Gorakṣanātha, by Gopināth Kavirāj

(f) Theism in Ancient India, by Gopināth Kavirāj.

(g) Hindu Poetics, by Baṭuka Nātha Śarmā.

(h) A seventeenth Century Astrolabe, by Padmākara Dvivedi

(i) Some aspects of Vīra Śaiva Philosophy, by Gopināth Kaviraj

(j) Nyāya Kusumāñjali (English Translation), by Gopi Nāth Kavirāj

(k) The Definition of Poetry, by Nārāyana Śāstrī Khiste.

(l) Sondala Upādhyāya, by Gopināth Kaviraj

Vol III—

(a) Index to Śabara's Bhāṣya by the late Col G. A Jacob.

(b) Studies in Hindu Law (3) · Judicial Procedure; by Gaṅgānāth Jhā

(c) Theism in Ancient India, by Gopināth Kavirāj

(d) History and Bibliography of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Literature, by Gopinath Kavirāj

(e) Naisadha and Śrī Harṣa by Nīlakamala Bhaṭṭāchārya.
(f) Indian Dramaturgy, by P N Patanakar

Vol IV—
(a) Studies in Hindu Law (4) Judicial Procedure by Gaṅganātha Jhā
(b) History and Bibliography of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Literature, by Gopināth Kaviraj
(c) Analysis of the Contents of the Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, by Maṅgala Deva Śastrî
(d) Nārāyaṇa's Gaṇita Kaumudî, by Padmakara Dvivedî.
(e) Food and Drink in the Ramāyanic Age, by Manmatha Nath Ray.
(f) Satkāryavāda Causality in Sāṅkhya, by Gopinath Kaviraj
(g) Discipline by Consequences, by G L Sinha
(h) History of the origin and expansion of the Aryans, by A C Ganguly
(i) Punishments in Ancient Indian Schools, by G L Sinha

Vol V—
(a) Ancient Home of the Aryans and their migration to India, by Atul Chandra Ganguly
(b) A Satrap Coin, by Shyam Lal Mehr
(c) An estimate of the civilisation of the Vānaras as depicted in the Ramāyana, by Manmatha Nath Ray
(d) A Comparison of the contents of the Rgveda, Vajasaneyi, Taittiriya-, and Atharvaveda-(Cāturadhyayika) Prātiśākhyas, by Mangala Deva Śastrî,
(e) Doctrine of Formal Training and the Ancient Indian Thought, by G L Sinha
(f) History and Bibliography of Nyaya Vaiśeṣika Literature, by Gopi Nath Kaviraj
(g) *An Index to the proper names occurring in Valmiki s* Ramayaṇa, by Manmatha Nath Ray
(h) Notes and Queries, by *Gopinath Kaviraj*

Vol VI—
(a) Index to Śabara s Bhaṣya by the late Col G A Jacob
(b) Some aspects of the History and Doctrines of the Nāthas, by Gopinath Kaviraj
(c) An Index to the proper names occurring in Vālmîki's Rāmāyana, by Manmatha Nath Ray
(d) Studies in Hindu Law (5) Evidence, by Gaṅgānatha Jhā.

(e) The Mîmānsā Manuscripts in the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares, by Gopinath Kaviraj.

(f) Notes and Queries; by Gopinath Kaviraj.

Vol. VII—

(a) Bhāmaha and his Kavyalankāra by Batuk Nath Sarma and Baldeva Upadhaya.

(b) Some variants in the readings of the Vāiśeṣika Sutrās by Gopinath Kaviraj.

(c) History and Bibliography of Nyaya-Vaiśeṣika Literature by Gopi Nath Kaviraj.

(d) An attempt to arrive at the correct meaning of some obscure Vedic words by Sitaram Joshi.

(e) A Comparison of the Contents of the Rgveda, Vājasaneyi, Jaittriya, and Atharvaveda (Caturadhyayika) Pratiśkhāys by Mangal Deva Shastri.

(f) An Index to the Rāmāyana by Manmatha Nath Ray.

(g) An Index to Sabaras Bhāsya by the Late Col. J. A. Jacob.

(h) Gleanings from the Tantras by Gopi Nath Kaviraj.

(i) The Date of Madhusudan Sarasvati by Gopi Nath Kaviraj

(j) Descriptive Notes on Sanskrit Manuscripts by Gopi Nath Kaviraj.

(k) A note on the meaning of the term 'Parardha' by Umesa Misra.

Vol. VIII—(In progress)

(a) Indian Philosophy (a Review) by Tarak Nath Sanyal

To be had of the—

(1) The Superintendent, Govt. Press, Allahabad.

(2) Messrs. Braj Bhushan Das & Co, Thatheri Bazar, Benares City.

(3) Babu Jaya Krishna Das Gupta, Chowkhamba Book Depot, Benares City.

I.—BHAMAHA AND HIS KAVYALANKARA

By Batuk Nath Sarma and Baldeva Upadhyaya.

Preliminary

In every age, in every clime, the importance of an author is weighed on the scales of utility by the coming posterity Plato and Aristotle command no inconsiderable recognition and deference even now—in the age which has seen cultural progress in almost all directions This is so, not only for the reason that their works were of the highest order, but also because they were made much use of by the generations coming after them So it seems that in order to gauge the merits of a particular author we should betake ourselves to the consideration of the kind of fame which that author has had the good fortune to call his own

Importance of भामह

Let us now turn to our own author and see whether he can stand the test successfully Even a desultory student of Sanskrit Poetics can bear testimony to the fact that there are a few famous names of old eminent authors which no later writer on the subject could afford to ignore without sacrificing his own high ambition of celebrity One of these such names is indeed that of भामह As far as we know there is no important work on Poetics which does not refer to भामह and his work in some way or other His work has been very frequently drawn upon for quotations by almost all the important writers of Sanskrit Poetics There are some who have even borrowed from his works 'matter and sometimes phraseology In the body of discussions he has been referred to as an authority of necessary recognition Even those who could not manage to agree with him on certain points have shown due deference to his views He has been commanding this respect from Sanskrit poets and poeticians, not for a century

or two, but for a very large number of centuries. The name which seems to have been most associated with the science of poetics from its early infancy (with the only exception of भरत) is that of भामह. He is indeed the oldest आलङ्कारिक and in fact one of the most authoritative ones whose work has come down to us.

Not only the old writers of India have had much to do with भामह and his work, even the modern scholars of vast erudition and wide reputation, have been attracted towards him. There was a time when a regular warfare was going on, with regard to the date and personality of भामह, among some of the leaders of Oriental Research in India, in which some western scholars of note also took part. Though nothing perfectly quite definite was arrived at, still much was written which shed new light on some obscure corners of historical investigation.

A BRIEF SURVEY OF DISCUSSIONS ON भामह

It would not be out of place to take here a very brief survey of the various problems raised and discussed with regard to भामह along with the conclusion reached by way of their solutions. Though, as noted above, भामह's name was to be heard everywhere among scholars, his work was not at first available anywhere. Bühler, not finding any trace of भामह's work, inferred, with the inevitable disappointment of a real scholar, that the work had been lost for ever.[1] In 1880, however, a MS of the work came to the notice of Gustav Oppert but we could not know much from his description.[2] In his memorable list of works on Sanskrit Poetics, Jacob noted the काव्यालङ्कार of भामह also,[3] but even this mention

1. Bühler's Kashmir Report, 1877
2. List of Sanskrit MSS. in private Libraries of Southern India, Vol. I. No. 3731.
3. J. R. A. S. 1897-8.

was not of much use In the edition of a certain Kanarese work[1] on Poetics, Mr K B Pathak also took notice of this work but it was only in passing and had nothing directly to do with it The first person to give publicity to भामह s work and to make definite statements about him, was R. Narsimhachar of Bangalore In the Introduction to his edition of a Kannada work[2] on Poetics he observed—' Next to him (Bharata) in point of time, comes Bhāmaha whose priority to Daṇḍin is proved by the latter criticising his views in the first chapter of Kavyādarśa He is one of the greatest authorities on Poetics his view being quoted by almost all the subsequent writers of note on the subject Prof Rangacharya M A of the Madras Presidency College has had the good fortune to come upon the manuscript of the valuable and long sought after work The work bears no date but the author probably belongs to the early part of the 6th century ' But as this was written in the Introduction of a Kannada work, it could not naturally come to the notice of most of the Sanskrit scholars

It was only when Mr M T Narsimhiengar wrote an article on भामह that the attention of Sanskrit scholars was drawn towards the great rhetorician Mr Narsimhiengar raised almost all those issues which engaged the attention of Indologists for a long time later on He thought that भामह was a Buddhist and flourished after दण्डी Dr Barnett, in that very year wrote a note, supporting Mr Narsimhiengar that भामह belonged to the first half of the 5th century[4] Mr P V Kane tried to refute

---

1 कविराजमार्ग edt by K B Pathak 1898

2 काव्यावलोकनम् by नागवर्मा, edt by R Narsimhachar, 1903

3 J R A S, 1905 p 535 ff

4 J R A S, 1905 p 841

Mr Narsimhiengar s hypothesis that भामह was a Buddhist, but as regards his date, he agreed with him[1] In 1909 विद्यानाथ's प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण was published by Mr K P. Trivedi in the Bombay Sanskrit Series In an 'Appendix' to this work भामह's काव्यालङ्कार appeared in print for the first time Mr Trivedi in his learned Introduction, dealt with many questions in connection with भामह His arguments were mainly directed against the views of Mr Narsimhiengar Dr Jacobi[2] and Prof Rangacharya[3] in 1910 and Mr Anantacharya[4] in 1911 joined issue and mainly agreed with Mr Trivedi Mr R Narsimhachar (the first person to give publicity to the discovery of भामह's work) added some new arguments to those already advanced in favour of the priority of भामह to दण्डी [5] In the same year Mr K B Pathak tried in a learned paper to refute many of the arguments put forward against him[6] But his refutations, as shown by Mr Trivedi the very next year, were as unconvincing as they were learned[7] This paper of Mr Trivedi seems to have silenced his opponents, and for a number of years nothing new was added to this important discussion In 1922 Dr Jacobi with his characteristic insight in all matters connected with Indology, suggested a new line of approach to the determination of भामह s date (as did also Mr P V Kane, quite independently of Dr Jacobi) He tried to prove that भामह had borrowed much from धर्मकीर्ति and that consequently he must be

---

1 J R A S 1908 p 543
2 Z D M G, 1910
3 Introduction to काव्यादर्श, 1910
4 Brahmavadin, 1911
5 Ind. Ant., 1912, p. 90 ff
6 Int. Ant., 1912 p. 232 ff
7 Ind. Ant., 1913

placed after him[1] To many this view appeared to be the last word in the discussion on the date of भामह Dr De[2] and others[3] seem to have followed in the foot steps of Jacobi

The last few years have seen a marked progress towards the study of Sanskrit Poetics and a few very valuable works have appeared on the subject Mr P V Kane deserves all praise for his intensive study and extensive researches[4] Dr S K De also is entitled to an especial mention He has rendered a valuable service to the cause of the study of the History of Sanskrit Poetics by his useful work[5] Dr Nobel s recently published book[6] and Mr B N Bhattacharya s paper[7] are also not to be lost sight of

In spite of so much writing no attempt has so far been made to see if it is possible to throw any new light on the subject nor even to sum up in one place all that has been written before भामह's work itself has till now been lying in a neglected condition in an obscure corner of प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण ।

An attempt is, therefore, being made here to present within the limits of a brief paper every information hitherto available regarding भामह and his work and in course of this presentation, to examine critically the current theories and to see if any of them is compatible with the date

1 Sitzungberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp 211-12

2 History of Sanskrit Poetics Vol 1, p 48

3 Nobel —Foundations of Indian Poetry, p 17

4 Introduction to his edition of साहित्यदर्पण, Bombay, 1923

5 History of Sanskrit Poetries, 2 Vols 1923

6 Foundations of Indian Poetry, Calcutta 1925

7 Calcutta Journal of Letters, Vol IX

recently brought to light. It is to be earnestly hoped that this humble attempt on our part will again remind the veteran scholars of their old friend भामह and will probably help to create for them a new interest in him

भामह—WHO AND WHAT HE WAS

We know very little with regard to भामह except what we find revealed in his काव्यालङ्कार Tradition says that he was a Kashmirian, and this is believed in by Buhler[1] and others[2] There is no reason to disbelieve it even though we have no reasonable evidence—external or internal—to prove it beyond doubt From the last śloka[3] of his काव्यालङ्कार, we learn that his name was भामह and that he was the son of रक्रिलगोमिन् The word रक्रिल, which bears phonetic resemblance to राहुल, पोत्तल, सोमिल and similar other Buddhist names, is alleged to suggest Buddhistic associations, and this suggestion would seem to gain strength from a consideration of the term गोमिन् which is reminiscent of the name of one of Buddha's disciples[4] Mr Pathak has shown that the word गोमिन् used to carry with it an idea of reverence[5]. He refers to a sutra of the चान्द्रव्याकरण[6] where the word is expressly stated to convey such a sense Moreover, the word सार्वसर्वज्ञ which occurs in the opening śloka[7] of भामह's work,

1 Bühler's Kashmir Report, p 64

2 Narsimhachar in his Introduction to नागवर्मा's काव्यावलोकनम् Ind Ant, 1912
Krishnamacharya History of Classical Sanskrit Literature

3. अवलोक्य मतानि सत्कवीनामवगम्य स्वधिया च काव्यलक्ष्म ।
सुजनावगमाय भामहेन ग्रथितं रक्रिलगोमिसूनुनेदम् ॥ काव्या० VI,64.

4 J. R. A S, 1905

5. Ind Ant., 1912

6. 'गोमिन् पूज्ये', 4. II. 144

7. प्रणम्य सार्वं सर्वज्ञं मनोवाक्कायकर्मभिः ।
काव्यालङ्कार इत्येष यथाबुद्धि विधास्यते ॥ काव्या. I 1.

cannot but point, so it is said, to the Buddha himself The word सार्व in its derivative meaning stands quite in *correspondence with the doctrine of universal love taught by* Buddha हेमचन्द्र[1] gives सार्व as one of the names of जिन जिनदेवमुनीश्वर[2] does exactly the same thing, except that he adds to the list of the synonyms the name सर्वीय In view of the well known fact that several Buddhist names were adopted by the Jains, one might feel justified in inferring from these Jain references that सार्व was originally an epithet of the Buddha The use of the word सर्वज्ञ for Buddha[3] is, of course, well known

Now taking these points into consideration, we may at *once confess that the arguments, stated above for proving* भामह to be a Buddhist, do not by themselves stand on a very firm ground As says Mr Kāne, there is not much in a name[4] *When the Hindus and the Buddhists had been living* in the same country for centuries and centuries together, there is no wonder if one borrowed the name of the other When this fact is found to be possible even in the case of such heterogenous peoples as the Hindus and the Mahomedans, it is even more possible *in the case of the* Hindus and the Buddhists. Moreover, we are to remember that Buddha himself had come to be recognised as an अवतार of विष्णु, certainly before the 11th century With Trivedi, we may add that the word गोमिन् is not exclusively used for the Buddhists It is explained by the नैघण्टुकs as a *contraction of* गोस्वामिन् It is a caste designation added after the names of the Brahmaṇas

---

1 अभिधान चिन्तामणि I,1, 25

2 अभिधान चिन्तामणि शिलोञ्छ

3 सर्वज्ञः सुगतो बुद्ध —अमरकोश

4. Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, p XVIII.

throughout Kashmir and Northern India and corresponds to the आचार्य of the South[1]

An author's religion may perhaps be judged from the contents of his book, but not from his name. In the whole of काव्यालङ्कार there is nothing peculiarly Buddhistic, nor is there any reference to the incidents of Buddha's life or to any purely Buddhistic legends. The *first verse* no doubt, salutes सार्वं सर्वज्ञ but the appellation सार्वं simply means सर्वस्मै हित[2] and is not given by any lexicographer as meaning Buddha exclusively. The word सर्वज्ञ is found in lexicons standing for Buddha as well as for Siva[3]. कुमारिल in his श्लोकवार्तिक devotes a long section to the refutation of "सर्वज्ञ", where he means by the term "Omniscient God" and not "Buddha". It is a significant fact that अमरसिंह, who was himself a Buddhist, does nowhere give the word सार्वं for Buddha in his अमरकोश।

The अपोहवाद् of the Buddhists, which represents their theory of verbal connotation, is criticised by भामह in a language which cannot be considered possible for a Buddhist[4] writer

---

1 See Trivedi's Introduction to प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण p xxxvii

2 हितप्रकरणे णं च सर्वशब्दात् प्रयुञ्जते ।
तदर्थमिष्टा च यथा सार्वं सर्वीय इत्यपि ॥

काव्या०—VI, 53

Cf पाणिनि 'सर्वपुरुषाभ्यां णढञौ' V 1 10 also

3 कृशानुरेताः सर्वज्ञो धूर्जटिर्नीललोहित अमरकोश

4 अन्यापोहेन शब्दोऽर्थमाहेत्यन्ये प्रचक्षते ।
अन्यापोहश्च नामान्यपदार्थापाकृति किल ॥
यदि गौरित्ययं शब्दः कृतार्थोऽन्यनिराकृतौ ।
जनको गवि गोबुद्धेर्मृग्यतामपरो ध्वनि ॥

काव्या०—VI, 16-17.

He speaks of Vedic rites and ceremonies in very high terms. The kings who drank Soma are highly spoken of[1]. Most of his examples refer to Brahmanical gods[2] and heroes. The famous Pauranic legend of the burning of काम by शिव has been referred to by भामह in very clear terms[3]. He very frequently alludes to the characters and incidents of रामायण. The meeting of राम with परशुराम[4], his exile to the forest of दण्डक in obedience to the orders of his father[5], his piercing with a single arrow the seven ताल trees[6], the promise of हनुमान् to search out the whereabouts of सीता[7]—these are some of the famous incidents of रामायण mentioned by भामह in his काव्यालङ्कार.

---

1. भूभृतां पीतसोमानां न्याय्ये वर्त्मनि तिष्ठताम् ।
अलङ्करिष्णुना वंशं गुरौ सति जिगीषुणा ॥ काव्या०-IV.48.

2. युगादौ भगवान् ब्रह्मा विनिर्मित्सुरिव प्रजाः । काव्या०-II 55 b.
समग्रगगनायाममानदण्डो रथाङ्गिनः ।
पादो जयति सिद्धस्त्रीमुखेन्दुनवदर्पणः ॥ काव्या०-III. 36.
विदधानौ किरीटेन्दू श्यामाभ्रहिमसच्छवी ।
रथाङ्गशूले बिभ्राणौ पातां वः शम्भुशार्ङ्गिणौ ॥ काव्या०-IV.21.
कान्ते इन्दुशिरोरत्ने आदधाने उदंशुनी ।
पातां वः शम्भुशर्वाण्यौ ...... ॥ काव्या०-IV.27.

3. स एकस्त्रीणि जयति जगन्ति कुसुमायुधः ।
हरतापि तनुं यस्य शम्भुना न हृतं बलम् । काव्या०-III. 25.

4. अत्याजयद्यया रामः सर्वक्षत्रवधाश्रयाम् ।
जामदग्न्यं युधा जित्वा सा ज्ञेया कोपबाधिनी ॥ काव्या०-V.44.

5. उदात्तशक्तिमान् रामो गुरुवाक्यानुरोधकः ।
विहायोपनतं राज्यं यथा वनमुपागमत् ॥ काव्या०-III. 11.

6. रामः सप्ताभिनत् तालान् । काव्या०-III. 32.

7. उपलप्स्ये स्वयं सीतामिति भर्तुर्निदेशतः ।
हनूमता प्रतिज्ञाय सा ज्ञातेत्यर्थसंधया ॥ काव्या०-IV. 37.

The references to the characters and incidents of महाभारत are far more numerous than those of रामायण. Almost all the important characters of महाभारत are found mentioned[1]. The promise of पुरु to suffer the miseries of old age in lieu of his father[2], and that of भीष्म for the life of a perfect celibate[3], have been alluded to by भामह, while illustrating different types of प्रतिज्ञा. Similarly, the gambling duel of युधिष्ठिर and शकुनि,[4], the terrible determination and performance of the drinking of दुःशासन's blood[5], and many other incidents[6] are also referred to. In a truly beautiful śloka, भामह describes the feeling of excessive joy expressed by विदुर on कृष्ण's arrival at his house[7]. In another śloka, the name of प्रद्युम्न, the son of कृष्ण, is found coupled with that of ऐल पुरूरवा, the progenitor of the lunar dynasty of Kṣatriyas[8].

---

1. See भामह's काव्यालङ्कार, III. 7, V. 31, V. 41.
2. जरामेष बिभर्मीति प्रतिज्ञाय पितुर्यथा
   तथैव पुरुणाभारि सा स्याद्धर्मनिबन्धिनी ॥ V. 36.
3. अद्यारभ्य निवत्स्यामि मुनिवद् वचनादिति
   पितुः प्रियाय यां भीष्मश्चक्रे सा कामबाधिनी ॥ V. 36.
4. आहूतो न निवर्तेय द्यूतायेति युधिष्ठिरः
   कृत्वा सन्धां शकुनिना दिदेवेत्यर्थबाधिनी ॥ V. 42.
5. भ्रातुर्भ्रातृव्यमुन्मथ्य पास्याम्यस्यासृगाहवे
   प्रतिज्ञाय यथा भीमस्तच्चकारायशो रथा ॥ V. 39.
6. See काव्यालङ्कार, II. 41, V. 41.
7. ...गृहागतं कृष्णमवादीद्विदुरो यथा ॥
   अद्य या मम गोविन्द जाता त्वयि गृहागते
   कालेनैषा भवेत् प्रीतिस्तवैवागमनात् पुनः ॥ III. 5.
8. भवन्त्यं दिग्गीरन्ध्रे स्वर्भैलः पुरूरवाः
   त्वमेव वीर प्रद्युम्नस्त्वमेव नरवाहनः ॥ V. 59.

Besides these references to the रामायण and the महाभारत, there are obvious allusions to the stories of उदयन, the king of the Vatsas, and of his son, नरवाहनदत्त, as described in the बृहत्कथा of गुणाढ्य [1] चाणक्य, the celebrated prime minister to चन्द्रगुप्तमौर्य, has been mentioned as going at night to the pleasure house of king नन्द [2]

Bearing in mind all these facts, we really wonder how a person professing a particular religion, should, when writing an important work, have totally forgotten his own religion and betaken himself always to another for illustrations There is no dearth of legendary stories among the Buddhists Had he so wished, he could have easily drawn upon them This fact becomes quite clear on looking into the works of *नमिसाधु and others, where it is found that all illus*trations are taken from their own religious legends Not only this. At times, in refuting अपोहवाद for instance, he becomes a bit aggressive to the pet ideas of the Buddhists If we remember what the influence of the Buddhists was before the advent of श्रीशङ्कराचार्य, what homage they commanded even from royal personages, a Buddhist s partiality towards the *Brahmanical* religion becomes still more inexplicable. We may admit that these points by themselves do not form any firm ground for the belief that our *author* was a *Hindu*, but we have also to admit that the arguments advanced for making him a Buddhist are even more flimsy and consequently less tenable It is still an open question and will continue to be, until some evidence of definite and undisputed character is forthcoming In the mean time we may assure ourselves on the strength of the data within our knowledge that there is more probability in भामह s being considered a Hindu than a Buddhist

---

1. काव्यालङ्कार, *IV* 39 etc
2. Ibid III 13

THE DATE OF भामह

The most important problem in connection with भामह is his date, It has been the cause of a heated controversy among a number of eminent orientalists for a number of years After such a long and impassionate discussion, one should expect to have a better result, namely, the exact determination of his date But unfortunately the result has been quite the reverse Nothing seems to have been achieved which is not even now enshrouded, to some extent, in the mist of doubt We propose here to state, as clearly as possible, the various arguments which have been put forward from time to time, to settle this vexed question

भामह like most of the Sanskrit writers, does not give any clue to his date in his own work There is no way of extracting evidence—internal or external—from any known source which may determine his date in exact numbers What we can do is simply to try to find out the two limits to his date as correctly as the data at our disposal can allow

Even there we do not seem to be on a very firm ground We can some how or other settle the lower limit of his date from quotations and references of later writers But when we proceed to determine the upper limit difficulties begin to multiply It is there that the great scholars have been crossing swords with each other Let us however, begin with the consideration of the lower limit to his date

By referring to the appendix of our text[1] or to the foot notes in Mr Trivedis text[2], it will be found that the earliest writer to quote भामह directly is आनन्दवर्द्धनाचार्य Then we learn from a number of later आलङ्कारिकs that उद्भट had written a commentary upon the काव्यालङ्कार of भामह[3] On

1 Published in the Kashi Sanskrit Series, Benares

2 Appendix VIII प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण (B S S XLV)

3. " विशेषोक्तिलक्षणे च भामहविवरणे भट्टोद्भट [illegible]

comparing the contents of उद्भट's independent work काव्यालङ्कारसङ्ग्रह with भामह's काव्यालङ्कार, it will appear that he had not been content with writing a commentary upon the work of भामह, but had freely drawn upon it for his own work[1]. As will be shown later on, he has not only copied भामह's definitions but has verily repeated them verbatim.

वामन's अलङ्कारसूत्रवृत्ति gives clear indications of his acquaintance with the work of भामह. It will be shown later on in detail how much and how far he was indebted to our author in the composition of his own work. It is quite sufficient to remember at present, that at some places[2] he seems to paraphrase the verses of भामह[3] in the form of sutras, at others[4] he appears to repeat those very

---

व्याख्याता यथेहास्माभिर्निरूपिताः"—प्रतिहारेन्दुराज in his commentary upon उद्भट's काव्यालङ्कारसंग्रह (Banhatti's Edn. p 14)

"भामहोक्तं शब्दश्छन्दोऽभिधानार्थः" इत्यभिधानस्य शब्दाद्भेदं व्याख्यातुं भट्टोद्भटो बभाषे"—अभिनवगुप्ताचार्य in his ध्वन्यालोकलोचन, p. 10 Also see pp 39, 207

"तस्माद्गड्डलिकाप्रवाहेन गुणालङ्कारभेद इति भामहविवरणे यद् भट्टोद्भटोऽभ्यधात् तन्निरस्तम्"—हेमचन्द्र in his अलङ्कार चूडामणि p 17 See also p 110

"'अपि च'शब्दानाकुलिता चेति तस्य हेतून् प्रचक्षते'इति भामहीये'यथा मनाकुलत्वेनापि भाविकम्' इति चोद्भटलक्षणे' etc , अलङ्कारसर्वस्व p 183. (Nirnaya Sagara Edn.)

1. See Dr De's History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I p 45. and Kane's *Introduction to* साहित्यदर्पण, p. XLII.

2. वामन's काव्यालङ्कारसूत्र, IV. 2 1

3 भामह's काव्यालङ्कार, II 30

4 IV. 2 20-21.

views which are held by भामह[1]. He has reproduced[2] one śloka which has been cited by भामह in the name of शाक्यवर्धन[3]. At another place[4] he inaccurately quotes a part of भामह's verse[5] and comments upon the use of a word in it. Such a similarity of language, such a correspondence of views, cannot be a matter of accident but must be attributed to the assimilation of the work of an author of established reputation.

It is clear from the above references that भामह flourished before उद्भट and वामन. The date of उद्भट can be fortunately settled with some precision[6]. He is referred to by आनन्दवर्धनाचार्य in his ध्वन्यालोक[7] and spoken of as the सभापति of जयापीड by कल्हण. जयापीड reigned in Kashmir from 779 to 813 A. C. As this king, on account of his misrule, became unpopular with the Pandits in the latter part of his reign, उद्भट must have lived in his court before 800 A. C. So the period of उद्भट's literary activity, may, with some probability, be assigned to the last quarter of the 8th century. His approximate date may therefore be taken as 800 A. C.

---

1. II. 50.
2. IV. 2, 10.
3. II. 46.
4. V. 2. 38
5. II. 27.
6. See N. D Banhatti's Introduction to his Edn. of उद्भट's अलङ्कारसारसंग्रह, (B. S. S. No. LXXIX, 1925, Poona); See also S. K. De's History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I, p. 75; P. V. Kane's Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, p. XLV; Buhler's Kashmir Report, p. 65.
7. "ध्वन्यलङ्कारान्तरप्रतिभायामपि श्लेषव्यपदेशो भवतीति दर्शितं भट्टोद्भटेन"-ध्वन्यालोक (निर्णयसागर Edn.) p. 96.
   "अन्यत्र वाच्यत्वेन प्रसिद्धो यो रूपकादिरलङ्कारः सोऽन्यत्र प्रतीयमान-

The date of वामन,[1] too, may be similarly settled राजशेखर, who lived about 900 A C[2], refers to the school of वामन[3]. This gives us the lower limit of वामन He must have lived before 900 A C

वामन quotes verses from the plays of भवभूति[4] Now भवभूति lived somewhere between 700 and 750 A C[5] वामन is, therefore, later than 750 According to राजतरङ्गिणी[6], a certain वामन was a minister of King जयापीड of Kashmir There is a tradition among the Pandits of Kashmir that the

---

तया बाहुल्येन प्रदर्शितस्तत्रभवद्भिर्भट्टोद्भटादिभि "—ध्वन्यालोक p 108

1 For details, see Sanskrit Introductions to Bombay and Banglore Editions of वामन's काव्यालङ्कारसूत्रवृत्ति, Dr Jha s Preliminary note to his translation of वामन's work, Dr S K De s History of Sanskrit Poetics Vol I-p 81ff, P V Kane s Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, pp XLVIII L

2 Mr C D Dalal s Introduction to काव्यमीमांसा, Dr Konow s Introduction to कर्पूरमञ्जरी (H O S)

3 "कवयोऽपि भवन्तीति वामनीया "—काव्यमीमांसा of राजशेखर (G O S, No 1 p 14)
" आग्रहपरिग्रहादपि पदस्थैर्यपर्यवसायस्तस्मात् पदानां परिवृत्तिवैमुख्यं पाकः ' इतिवामनीया "—Ibid p 20

4 इयं गेहे लक्ष्मीरियममृतवर्तिर्नयनयो etc —उत्तररामचरित cited by वामन under IV 3 6
पिञ्जलीपन्नलिम etc. मालतीमाधव cited by वामन under V 2 18

5 See R G Bhandarkar s preface to his edn of मालतीमाधव (B S S No XV) p XIII—XVII Bombay, 1905, also Smith s paper in J R A S, 1908, p 793

6 " मनोरथ शङ्खदत्तश्चटक सन्धिमांस्तथा ।
बभूवु कवयस्तस्य वामनाद्याश्च मन्त्रिण " ॥ IV 497.

author of काव्यालङ्कार सूत्रवृत्ति was identical with this minister. Bühler[1] believes in this tradition and we see no reason to disbelieve it. So, as shown above, उद्भट and वामन are almost synchronous. It is possible that they were rivals of each other. But it is curious that neither of them refers to the other. Howsoever it may be, the date of उद्भट and वामन is approximately about 800 A. C.

शान्तरक्षित quotes three ślokas[2] from भामह's काव्यालङ्कार[3] which are definetely ascribed to him by the commentator कमलशील.[4] Now शान्तरक्षित lived from 705 to 762 A.C[5]. Thus 700 A. C. may be safely taken to be the lower limit of भामह, though, as we shall show later on, his real lower limit is furnished by बाण.

Now we come to determine the upper limit to the date of भामह. It is here that we have to encounter difficulties of the highest magnitude Many suggestions have been made, many theories have been propounded. Let us take them one by one and try to see how much water they can hold.

भामह has at one place referred to a न्यासकार. Some scholars were led to think that this point would be of great help in settling a terminus of भामह. A keen and heated controversy ensued and has been raging for a long time. The credit of raising this learned question and then fighting single-handed to maintain his hypothesis with deep scholarship and reasonable plausibility, belongs to the great orientalist, Prof. K. B. Pathak. He found in भामह's mention of

1. See Bühler's Kashmir Report, p. 65.
2. तत्त्वसङ्ग्रह, slokas 912—914 (G.O S. No. XXX)
3. VI. 17—19.
4. तत्त्वसङ्ग्रह p 291.
5. See Mr. B. Bhattacharya's Foreword (pp. XIII—XVI) to the तत्त्वसङ्ग्रह

न्यासकार a clear reference to जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि, the Buddhist author of काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका, whom he placed, on the evidence of the Chinese traveller, Itsing, in the 7th century On the basis of this supposition, he tried to prove that भामह must be assigned to the 8th century[1] He found a very strong opponent in Mr K P Trivedi who proved to the hilt that the structure of Prof Pathak s hypothesis was raised upon the foundation of sands[2] Mr Trivedi, on the merit of his stronger arguments, was supported by almost all the writers on the subject,[3] and was perhaps able at last to convince of his reasonableness even the originator of this controversy[4]

The verses where न्यासकार is alluded to in the काव्यालङ्कार of भामह, run thus —

> शिष्टप्रयोगमात्रेण न्यासकारमतेन वा ।
> तृचा समस्तषष्ठीकं न कथञ्चिदुदाहरेत् ॥
> सूत्रज्ञापकमात्रेण वृत्रहन्ता यथोदितः ।
> अकेन च न कुर्वीत वृत्तिं तद्गमको यथा ॥

The simple meaning of this extract may be thus expressed—A poet should not make use of a compound, one member of which is formed by adding the suffix तृच् and the

---

1 J R A. S Bom ; Vol xxlii Ind Ant , Vol. xli, 1912

2 Introd to प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण, pp xxxv ff, Ind Ant , xlii, 1913

3 Mr Kane—Introd to साहित्यदर्पण, pp xxxv—xxxvi ,
Dr S K. De–History of Sanskrit Poetics Vol. I, p 47,
Dr Jacobi—Sb der Preuss Akad xxiv (1912) pp 210—211 ,
Sovani—Pre-Dhvani Schools, Bh. Com Vol , p 393.

4 As far as we know, Prof Pathak has written nothing after 1913 on this subject.

other by the terminations of the genitive case, supporting it by reference to the usage of a learned man or following the view of न्यासकार. One should not make such a use as was done, when the word वृत्रहन्ता was cited by saying that the sutra of Pāṇini becomes ज्ञापक in such a case. Neither should he bring about a compound of words ending with अक with words ending in the genitive case, as, for example, तद्गमक. The sum and substance of भामह's contention is simply this that पाणिनि's sutra तृजकाभ्यां कर्तरि (II 2 15) should be strictly followed and no षष्ठीतत्पुरुष compound formed with words ending in the subjective तृच् and अक suffixes. Consequently no compound takes place in cases like अपां स्रष्टा, वज्रस्य भर्ता, ओदनस्य पाचक etc. Now the passage in जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि's काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका (popularly known as न्यास) which discusses the use of such compounds, runs as follows :—

अथ किमर्थं तृचः सानुबन्धस्योच्चारणम्? तृनो निवृत्त्यर्थम्। नैतदस्ति तद्योगे न लोकाव्ययेत्यादिना षष्ठीप्रतिषेधात्। एवं तर्हि एतदेव ज्ञापकं भवति तद्योगेऽपि क्वचित् षष्ठी भवतीति। तेन भीष्मः कुरूणां भयशोकहन्तेत्येवमादि सिद्धं भवति।

This passage is found in connection with the sutra तृजकाभ्यां कर्तरि (II 2 15). Here the न्यासकार is discussing the utility of the अनुबन्ध 'च' in तृच्. पाणिनि could have easily said त्रकाभ्याम् rather than तृजकाभ्याम्। Why has he inserted च? The answer to this question as given by जिनेन्द्र is that it serves to exclude तृन्. But there comes in another difficulty. तृन् cannot be used with words ending in षष्ठी by न लोकाव्ययनिष्ठाखलर्थतृनाम् (II 3. 69). षष्ठीसमास is out of question. This objection is met by saying that this very sutra becomes ज्ञापक so that the genitive can be used with the words ending in तृच्. The prohibition by लोकाव्ययनिष्ठा

etc is inconstant So whenever we meet with a compound of a word ending with a genitive termination and another ending in तृ, we should say that the suffix added is not तृच् but तृन् Now, on comparison of these two passages with each other it will be evident that भामह insists upon the prohibition of षष्ठीसमास with words ending in तृच् and अक. As seen in another place[1], he had a very high regard for the authority of पाणिनि In this particular case also, he wants us to follow the rule of पाणिनि quite literally He catches this opportunity of referring to the view of a न्यासकार who had allowed (as would appear from the words of भामह) the use of such compounds by saying that this sutra of पाणिनि could very well be taken as a ज्ञापक It would also appear that the न्यासकार had actually cited the example वृत्रहन्ता and तद्गमक To ordinary eyes the words of भामह are as clear as anything and they need no torture from out side, unless, of course, they are meant to yield the desired import already conceived

Prof Pathak takes great pains to explain this extract in his own favourite way at one place[2] and elsewhere[3] he gives the sum and substance of his contention We shall just quote a few sentences from the latter place to show the position assumed by the Professor upon this question " It will be sufficient he says " for my present purpose to point out that in the verses cited above Bhāmaha condemns all genitive compounds like वृत्रहन्ता and तद्गमक as ungrammatical, and says that such compounds should never be employed by young authors aspiring to eminence. When he contrasts the शिष्टप्रयोगमात्र with the न्यासकारमत, he does

1 अद्वैत जाति मतं हि पाणिनीयम् -काव्यालङ्कार VI 63

2 J R A S Bomb, Vol XXIII p 138

3 Ind Ant XLI 1912 p 234

not mean to say that this particular compound वृत्रहन्ता is used by the शिष्ट or justified by the Nyāsakāra Bhāmaha mentions this word वृत्रहन्ता as an illustration of the class of genitive compounds justified by the Nyāsakāra. This is amply proved by the expression इत्येवमादि in the sentence भीष्म : कुरूणां भयशोकहन्तेत्येवमादि and by the ज्ञापक discriminating between तृच् and तृन् which applies to all genitive compounds like वृत्रहन्ता।"

Thus Prof Pathak would have us believe that, in spite of the difference existing between the two, भामह and जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि mean the same thing As shown above भामह and न्यासकार had supported the use of तृच् compound by the help of पाणिनि's ज्ञापकसूत्र। He had perhaps nothing to say about तृन् at that place But जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि speaks of तृन्, so that wherever we meet with such compounds, he would call the termination तृन् and not तृच्।

Let us put the whole thing more clearly. पाणिनि has laid down that compounds of words ending in the genitive terminations with words ending in the subjective तृच् and अक affixes, should never be formed But difficulty arose when the use of such compounds was met with in the writings of classical writers Now the grammarians were bound to support such uses some how or other. It became especially more binding on them to support such uses for the reason that even in the sutras of पाणिनि such as जनिकर्तुः प्रकृतिः, such compounds are to be found The important views on the point can be thus stated —

(i) Some say that, as पाणिनि himself has made use of such compounds in the sutras जनिकर्तुः प्रकृतिः, तत्प्रयोजको हेतुश्च, the निषेध implied by the sutra तृजकाभ्यां कर्तरि, is not absolutely binding in certain cases such compounds may be allowed

(ii) जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि, the famous author of the काशिकान्यास, would like to say that the termination here is तृन् and not तृच् and that the prohibition of षष्ठी in the case of तृन् by the rule न लोकाव्यय etc is अनित्य

(iii) कैयट and others hold that in such cases we should explain the 6th case ending as an instance of शेषे षष्ठी. भट्टोजिदीक्षित, who raised this question in his सिद्धान्तकौमुदी[1] and summed up all the views in his प्रौढमनोरमा,[2] seems to favour the view of कैयट ;

(iv) There may be some who having too much regard for grammatical purity, would not permit such uses in any way

It goes without saying that भामह would be very greatly inclined—as he surely is in his काव्यालङ्कार— to hold the last view It is known to all who have any knowledge of Sanskrit Poetics that grammatical purity is not identical with rhetorical purity An expression may be grammatically justified, but it need not, on that account, be consistent with the canons or dicta of good poetry In poetry expression is as important as the matter it represents If an expression is doubtful in point of its structural purity, it will not commend itself to a good poet even though the doubt may be the slightest one This was indeed the position of भामह From the way in which he refers to the view of a certain न्यासकार,

---

1 कथं तर्हि "घटानां निर्मातुस्त्रिभुवनविधातुश्च कलहः" इति । शेषषष्ठ्या समास इति कैयटः ।

2 शेषषष्ठ्या इति । केचित्तु *जनिकर्तुः प्रकृतिस्तत्प्रयोजको हेतुश्चेति*-निर्देशादनित्योऽयं निषेध इत्याहुः । न्यासकारस्त्वाह । तृन्नन्तमेतत् । न लोकेति षष्ठीनिषेधस्त्वनित्यः । अकाभ्यामिति वक्तव्ये तृच सानुबन्धकस्य ग्रहणाज्ज्ञापकादिति ।

it would appear that even in his days such grammatical speculations were quite brisk, and the point in question has also attracted the attention of scholars. Perhaps the most important view on this point was that which finds its criticism in the काव्यालङ्कार of भामह, viz., that पाणिनि's sutras were taken as ज्ञापक and the निषेध prescribed by the rule तृजकाभ्यां etc. was considered अनित्य.

Let us now compare the view criticised by भामह with the four views stated above and try to find if it corresponds with any of them. It will be seen at once that it coincides with the first one. It will also appear that the first view is distinctly different from the second one which is held by जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि.

Let us now turn towards the examples. The example found in भामह's काव्यालङ्कार is वृत्रहन्ता but in जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि's न्यास it is भीष्मः कुरूणां भयशोकहन्ता. They do not correspond. Prof. Pathak tells us that " Bhāmaha has mentioned this word घृत्रहन्ता as an illustration of the class of genitive compounds justified by the Nyāsakāra." It is indeed inconceivable why भामह should bring in another set of examples and not use the same which were used by जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि, especially when he was so opposed to his view as to refer to him so very pointedly. It is a common practice among good writers that when they have to discuss or even simply refer to such things, they always cite those very examples which were given by their predecessors. हरदत्त[1], for instance, when giving the substance of the passage quoted above, refers to the

1. कथं भीष्मः कुरूणां भयशोकहन्तेत्युच्यते । तृजन्तमेतत् । न च लोकाव्ययनिष्ठेति (II. 3. 69) षष्ठीनिषेधः । यत्तृजकाभ्यामित्यत्र तृचः सानुबन्धकस्योपादानं तृनो निषेधं ज्ञापयति तृनो योगे क्वचित् षष्ठीति न्यासः ।

example of जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि भट्टोजिदीक्षित [1] undoubtedly begins this discussion with a quite different sentence but his position was not the same as that of जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि or of शरणदेव. He is neither criticising nor summarising the statement of the न्यासकार. He selects the sentence from a very popular श्लोक[2] which, the tradition says, was *composed by* भवभूति *while holding a verbal fight with* an opponent This context perhaps becomes a commentary upon the happy selection of an example on the part of the learned author of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी ।

A scholar has to be particularly careful about his language when he is engaged in a discussion with another scholar The same is the case with जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि who draws his example from the popular work, the महाभारत But the position of भामह was totally different In criticising the न्यासकार he must necessarily quote the same example, and this is what he actually did The word उदित', in the sentence सूत्रज्ञापकमात्रेण वृत्रहन्ता यथोदित, clearly proves it He would have never used the word उदित. if he had selected the example at random

When Prof Pathak speaks of जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि as the only न्यासकार, 'he tells us something less than the truth In spite of his attempt to prove otherwise, there did exist several न्यास's besides the one attributed to जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि माधवाचार्य, as pointed out correctly by Mr Trivedi,[3] mentions in his धातुवृत्ति the names of क्षेमेन्द्रन्यास, न्यासोद्योत, बोधिन्यास, शाकटायनन्यास etc The attempt made by *Prof*

---

1. कथं तर्हि घटानां निर्मातुस्त्रिभुवनविधातुश्च कलह इति etc
2 See भोज प्रबन्ध (निर्णयसागर)
3 Ind Ant., Vol XLII, 1913, p 261
4 "स्पष्टं चैव सूत्रधृत इत्यत्र स्यादयमर्थान्तिषु । अत्र क्षेमेन्द्र न्यासे

Pathak to explain them away by saying that 'the word न्यास is frequently used in the sense of grammatical treatise or commentary'[1] does not seem to improve his position in any way बाण in his हर्षचरित, as first pointed out by Mr. Kane[2], refers to a न्यास. The expression used there is कृतगुरुपदन्यासाः which is explained by the commentator शङ्कर as कृतोऽभ्यस्तो गुरुपदे दुर्बोधशब्दे न्यासो वृत्तिवि (वि) वरणं यै.[3]. None has so far tried to prove that जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि lived before the reign of हर्षवर्द्धन. Mr. R. Narsimhachar[4] writes about a न्यास written by पूज्यपाद, who, according to Mr. Rice, lived about 500 A. C.

Even if it were possible (but in fact it is not) to show that the न्यासकार referred to by भामह, may be जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि, it is not easy to prove that भामह came after जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि। The only ground on which Prof Pathak placed him about 700 A C., is a string of confused statements of the Chinese traveller, Itsing, about the grammarians of those times All

---

पणतेः सार्वधातुकेऽप्यायविकल्प उक्तः-धातुवृत्ति (Mysore Edn.) Vol. I., p. 266.

"अकथितं च इत्यत्र न्यासे .निवहि हरि जिद्ण्दीन् प्रस्तुत्य .... न्यासोद्योतेच अजादीनां पामादीनां चेप्सिततमत्वमविशिष्टमित्युक्तम् ibid Vol. I., Pt II , p. 529

बोधिन्यासेऽपि सातिः परे वर्तते सौत्र इति । जिनेन्द्रदत्तौ सातिहेंतुमण्ण्यन्तः इति-ibid Vol. 5. Pt. I, p 122.

शाकटायनन्यासकृतोऽप्ययमेव पक्षोऽभिमतः—ibid Vol. I. Pt. I. p. 94.

It is to be noted here that in all these quotations जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि is distinctly referred to.

1. Ind. Ant., Vol. XLI, 1912, p 233
2. J. R. A S., Bomb 1909, p. 94.
3. हर्षचरित (Führer's Edn) p 133.
4. Ind. Ant. XLI, 1912, p. 91.

these statements cannot be accepted as perfectly correct Dr Jacobi[1] has therefore rightly called in question the date assigned by Prof Pathak to जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि Keilhorn[2], while noticing a fragment from जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि s work in Poona wrote My impression certainly was that Jinendrabuddhi has freely copied from Haradatta s Padamanjari Dr Jacobi[3] has shown, on the authority of भविष्योत्तरपुराण that हरदत्त died in 878 A C This will take जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि to the 10th century at least *We have already shown*[4] that भामह cannot be later than 700 A C It is impossible for जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि to have copied from the पदमञ्जरी of हरदत्त and still be a predecessor of भामह

We may now sum up this part of our discussion The न्यासकार referred to by भामह is not जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि as was supposed by Prof Pathak He was an old writer whose work has now become extinct and who is wholly unknown to us His view as known from भामह seems to be referred to by भट्टोजिदीक्षित in his प्रौढमनोरमा। So an attempt to find out the other terminus of भामह, with the help of his reference to न्यासकार, cannot go very far and we must look up to something else for it

भामह and माघ

While dealing with one of the main contributions of Prof Pathak to the determination of भामह s date we may in passing just note *another interesting point* raised by the learned professor[5] This refers to an unconvincing attempt

1 Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wis *senschaften XXIV p 210*

2 J R A S 1908 p 499

3 Sitz d Preuss Akad d Wiss xxs p 211

4 p 16 above

5 J R A S Bomb Vol XXIII p 31

made by him to find out some chronological relation between भामह and माघ भामह, at one place,[1] expresses his view about the constitution of काव्य and says शब्दार्थौ सहितौ काव्यम्—a view which has attracted the attention of almost *all later आलङ्कारिक s of note माघ has in शिशुपालवध II 86* the following beautiful श्लोक—

नालम्बते दैष्टिकतां न निषीदति पौरुषे ।
शब्दार्थौ सत्कविरिव द्वयं विद्वानपेक्षते ॥

Now it is argued that माघ must have been acquainted with भामह's काव्यालङ्कार before he expressed himself in such a strain This point is maintioned here, not for its importance but for its interest We need not, therefore, go into detail over this question Those who feel interested may read the refutation of this argument in the paper of Mr Kane[2] We shall only quote a few lines from Dr. J. Nobel's book[3] and leave the rest to the imagination of curious readers "Māgha is said," writes Dr. J Nobel, "to refer to the definition of Kāvya as given by Bhāmaha, but if this is considered as an argument I may be allowed to take as an argument of the same force that Kalidāsa in Raghuvaṇśa I 1, by the words *Vāgarthāviva samprktau* refers to the very same definition of Bhāmaha, and that by this fact Bhāmaha's priority may be taken for granted By using the simile of Śabdārtha, however, Māgha probably refers to that of Kālidāsa or perhaps to some other view and not the definition of Kāvya in Bhāmaha. This argument however, is of no great value, because the so called definition of Kāvya (as consisting of word and sense united) may go back to some older Alamkārikas

1 काव्यालङ्कार, I 16

2 J R.A.S Bomb Vol XXIII, p. 91 ff

3 The foundations of Indian Poetry, p 15—16

भामह and कालिदास

Still more interesting and equally important is the view which seeks to establish the priority of कालिदास to our author. In भामह's काव्यालङ्कार I 42 44 we read—

अयुक्तिमद् यथा दूता जलभृन्मारुतेन्दवः ।
तथा भ्रमरहारीतचक्रवाकशुकादयः ॥
अवाचो व्यक्तवाचश्च दूरदेशविचारिणः ।
कथं दूत्यं प्रपद्येरन्निति युक्त्या न युज्यते ॥
यदि चोत्कण्ठया यत्तदुन्मत्त इव भाषते ।
तथा भवतु भूम्नेदं सुमेधोभिः प्रयुज्यते ॥

भामह is criticising here those poets who make in *their works the cloud, the wind, the moon and similarly* some birds to appear as messengers He calls this an instance of अयुक्तिमद्दोष It goes wholly against reason, he says, that such creatures should be able to perform the duties of messengers But he concedes this in the case of those intelligent poets, who, when making use of such devices, show them to be employed by men who are out of their wits.

Now some scholars[1] argue that भामह must have had in mind the मेघदूत of कालिदास where a cloud has been used as a messenger It is also pointed out that a passage[2] of भामह seems to borrow an idea and phraseology from two

1. Haricand —L'Art Poetique de L'Inde, p 77,
V. V Sovani—Pre-dhawani Schools, Bhandarkar commomoration Volume, p 393,
S K De —History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol I 48

2 अस्मिन् जहीहि सुहृदि प्रणयाभ्यसूयामाश्लिष्यगाढमुमाननमादरेण ।
चित्रं महानिव घन समयेऽभिवर्षन्नानन्दबाष्पजलवारिभिरश्नु स्याम् ॥
I 56

श्लोकs[1] of कालिदास This shows that कालिदास must have flourished before भामह

Others, on the other hand hold quite an opposite view "Bhāmahācharya, writes Dr T Ganpati Sastri[2], "it seems to me, must have lived long prior to Kalidasa For while he mentions such names of poets and poems as Medhavi, Rāma Śarma, Aśmakavamśa, Ratnaharaṇa, Achyutottara, all unknown to us, he has never mentioned the name of Kalidāsa of world wide fame or any of his works of supreme excellence But had Bhamaha ever seen the poems of Kālidasa he would have of course mentioned them or made them also as in the case of Pratijnānitika subject of his criticism After this the learned Pandit quotes those three verses of भामह[3] which we have given above and remarks—'From this we cannot conclude that भामह was conversant with the poem Meghaduta, for then we could as well infer that he knew also of Śukasandeśa written by a poet of yesterday, Hence, I think, that by these ślōkas, our Achārya only teaches us generally that the fashion in some of our Kāvyas of lovers sending messages through such inanimate objects as the wind, the moon the clouds and such living inarticulate creatures as the bee, the chakravaka and the parrot is not desirable on occasions when the sender of the message is in a state of sobriety Bearing in mind this instruction of our

1 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
—रघुवंश XIV 7-8

2 Introduction to स्वप्नवासवदत्ता and प्रतिज्ञायौगन्धरायण (Trivandrum Edn)

3 काव्यालङ्कार, I 42-44

Achārya, Kālidāsa, with his keen sense of poetic propriety, observes, in defence of his message through the cloud at the begining of Meghadūta :—

धूमज्योतिःसलिलमरुतां सन्निपातः क्व मेघः
सन्देशार्थाः क्व पटुकरणैः प्राणिभिः प्रापणीयाः ।
इत्यौत्सुक्यादपरिगणयन् गुह्यकस्तं ययाचे
कामार्ता हि प्रकृतिकृपणाश्चेतनाचेतनेषु॥—पूर्वमेघ ।

Thus it is seen that Bhāmaha lived much prior to Kalidāsa."

This long quotation from the most important exponent of this side of the view, will make the position quite clear. It may be interesting to know that Dr Nobel also was formerly a believer in the priority of भामह to कालिदास. Even now, with his belief slightly shaken, *(simply because he could not directly prove it) he is more inclined to accept the priority of* भामह *to* कालिदास *than that of* कालिदास *to* भामह.[1]

Taking the arguments from both sides into consideration, we may confess that much can be said on both sides and that nothing is really settled. One cannot imagine that such a criticism can be possible without any work to be criticised and explain on the other hand, why other things connected with कालिदास should not have come under the notice of भामह, if the works of the great poet were known to him.

Whatsoever may be the fact, it is needless to carry this discussion to any further length, because, even if it were decided one way or the other, it will not in any way help us in determining the date of भामह. The date of कालिदास itself is a bone of contention and cannot be made a basis for determination of other dates.

1 See Nobel's The Foundations of Indian Poetry, pp 14-15

भामह AND भास.

The same remark is to be made with regard to the chronological relation of भामह and भास, though in this case, it has not been suggested by any person that भामह came after the author of the work he is criticising. The difficulty with us here is that we cannot exactly know what work he is criticising. The verses in the काव्यालङ्कार of भामह which refer to the criticism in question read thus—

विजिगीषुमुपन्यस्य वत्सेशं वृद्धदर्शनम् ।
तस्यैव कृतिनः पश्चादभ्यधाच्चरशून्यताम् ॥
अन्तर्योधशताकीर्णं सालङ्कायननेतृकम् ।
तथाविधं गजच्छद्म नाज्ञासीत् स स्वभूगतम् ॥
यदि वोपेक्षितं तस्य सचिवैः स्वार्थसिद्धये ।
अहो नु मन्दिमा तेषां भक्तिर्वा नास्ति भर्तरि ॥
शरा दृढधनुर्मुक्ता मन्युमद्भिररातिभिः ।
मर्माणि परिहृत्यास्य पतिष्यन्तीति कानुमा ॥
हतोऽनेन मम भ्राता मम पुत्रः पिता मम ।
मातुलो भागिनेयश्च रुषा संरब्धचेतस ॥
अस्यन्तो विविधान्याजावायुधान्यपराधिनम् ।
एकाकिनमरण्यानां न हन्युर्बहवः कथम् ॥
नमोऽस्तु तेभ्यो विद्वद्भ्यो येऽभिप्रायं कवेरिमम् ।
शास्त्रलोकावपास्यैव नयन्ति नयवेदिनः ॥
सचेतसो वनेभस्य चर्मणा निर्मितस्य च ।
विशेषं वेद बालोऽपि कष्टं किन्तु कथं नु तत् ॥ IV.39-46

The stories of उदयन, the king of वत्सs, were very popular in ancient India, so much so that many works, even besides those which directly devote themselves to them, refer to them here and there So when we find such a criticism in the work of भामह, we cannot exactly determine what is the actual object of his criticism Dr T Ganapati Śāstri suggests that the work criticised must be प्रतिज्ञायौगन्धरायण. "The subject reviewed by Bhāmaha above, says the eminent

editor, " is seen in its entirety in Pratijnanatika Moreover, the Prakrit passage " अणेण मम भादा हदेा, अणेण मम पिदा, अणेण मम सुदेा" in the first Act of Pratijñanātika is quoted in the *form* of verse, " हतोऽनेनमम भ्राता मम पुत्र· पिता मम " by Bhamaha, in his enquiry on Nyayavirodha

In spite of this suggestion made by the learned Pandit, we may observe that the case is much doubtful भामह does not mention the name of भास or his प्रतिज्ञायेागन्धरायण He may be criticising गुणाढ्य's बृहत्कथा itself which was indeed the oldest compendium of such stories The Prakrit portion common with भामह's श्लोक, might have a similar representative passage there also Moreover, the theory of the learned Śastri itself, as observes Mr Kane, is based on a very weak foundation If we examine the passage from भामह *more closely, it will be found that the story criticised* by him is not exactly the same as found in प्रतिज्ञायेागन्धरायण It corresponds more with the versions found in बृहत् कथा मञ्जरी and कथा सरित्-सागर They are known to be the epitomes of बृहत्कथा But even if it was proved that it is भास who has been criticised, it will not help us in any way For the last 14 years, a sharp controversy has been going on, not only with regard to the date of भास, but also concerning the authenticity of the works published in his name As there is no certainty *about the date of* भास *there is no use putting* it forward as a terminus of भामह

भामह AND भट्टि ।

It will not be perhaps out of place to devote some space here for discussing the relation of भट्टि and भामह It is a well known tradition among the Pandits of India that भट्टि, the famous author of the grammatical Kavya, known as रावणवध *or* simply as भट्टिकाव्य, tried to furnish illustrations

to the काव्यालङ्कार in the four cantos (X—XIII) known as प्रसन्नकाण्ड exactly as he did in others for the sutras of Paṇini. This tradition finds further support from the statements of the commentators[1]. It would appear from the way they write that भट्टि wrote the 10th canto to illustrate figures of word and sense, 11th, माधुर्यगुण, 12th, भाविक and the 13th Sanskrit and Prakrit Kavya. प्रसादगुण finds its illustration in all the four cantos. If we look at the श्लोकs illustrating अलङ्कारs in canto X, we shall find, from the order and the way they are given, that भट्टि had भामह's काव्यालङ्कार before him The commentators जयमङ्गल and मल्लिनाथ have freely drawn upon the work of भामह for giving the definitions of these अलङ्कारs in their commentaries.[2] They could have easily taken the definitions from later and fuller rhetorcial works. But then the illustrative श्लोकs would not have so well conformed to those definitions. There is a श्लोक in भामह's काव्यालङ्कार which is found in भट्टिकाव्य with very slight alterations. The श्लोक of भामह is—

काव्यान्यपि यदीमानि व्याख्यागम्यानि शास्त्रवत् ।
उत्सवः सुधियामेव हन्त दुर्मेधसो हताः ॥ —II. 20

In भट्टिकाव्य we have

---

1. शब्दलक्षणमुक्तमपि लक्षयन् काव्यलक्षणार्थं प्रसन्नकाण्डमुच्यते, काव्यस्यात्र प्रसन्नत्वात् । प्रथमं चेदं लक्षणं यत्प्रसन्नता नाम आविद्वदङ्गनाबालप्रतीतार्थं प्रसन्नवदिति ' . ... तथास्मिन् काण्डे चत्वारः परिच्छेदाः । अलङ्कार माधुर्यप्रदर्शनदोषाः भाषासमावेशश्चेति etc —जयमङ्गल in his commentary, in the beginning of canto X.

शब्दलक्षणप्रधानेऽप्यस्मिन् काव्ये काव्यलक्षणत्वादधिकारकण्डानन्तरमलङ्कार माधुर्य भाविक भाषासमाख्य परिच्छेदचतुष्टयात्मकमारभमाणोऽस्मिन् सर्गे तावदलङ्कारपरिच्छेदं वदन्नादौ शब्दालङ्कारान् लेशतो दर्शयति । —मल्लिनाथ in his commentary on भट्टिकाव्य in the beginning of canto X.

2. See परिशिष्ट to our edn. of भामह's काव्यालङ्कार. जयमङ्गल has no less than 33 quotations from this work.

व्याख्यागम्यमिदं काव्यमुत्सवः सुधियामलम् ।
हता दुर्मेधसश्चास्मिन् विद्वत्प्रियतया मया ॥—XXII.34.

Here it can be imagined quite easily that one of the two must have borrowed from the other. श्रीवत्साङ्कमिश्र ascribes the former श्लोक to भामह. There on this authority it necessarily follows that भट्टि must have imitated भामह in writing his श्लोक.[1] All these facts, stated above, cannot but point to one conclusion, in that भामह was prior to भट्टि.

Now as regards the date of भट्टि, the only clue which we have is his श्लोक forming the last verse of his काव्य. It is—

काव्यमिदं विहितं मया वलभ्यां
श्रीधरसेननरेन्द्रपालितायाम् ।
कीर्तिरतो भवतान्नृपस्य तस्य
प्रेमकरः क्षितिपो यतः प्रजानाम् ॥—XXII. 35.

The history of Kathiawar tells us that there were four Kings with the name of धरसेन who ruled over वलभी (modern Vala). It is not quite clear which धरसेन is alluded to by भट्टि[2].

Prof. B. C. Mazumdar[3] identifies the author of भट्टिकाव्य with वत्सभट्टि, mentioned in the Mandasor Sun Temple Inscription,[4] dated 473 A.C. on the ground of similarty *between the verses of the inscription and the description* of autumn in the भट्टिकाव्य.[5] But this identification is considered by Prof. Keith as a 'most unfortunate suggestion'[6].

1. Trivedi—Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII, p. 264.
2. For more information, see Mr Trivedi's Introduction to भट्टिकाव्य (B. S. S. No LVI.)
3. J. R. A. S., 1904, pp. 395-397.
4. Fleet's *Gupta Inscriptions, No. 18*.
5. Canto II.
6. J. R. A. S., 1909, p. 759.

But the two learned professors are at one in saying that भट्टि flourished before भारवि and दण्डी. We may go so far as to say, with Mr. Trivedi[1] that "our poet lived in the latter part of the sixth and the beginning of the seventh century." But the safest course will be to side with Mr. Kane[2] and say that "भट्टि must have lived sometime between 500 and 650 A.C."[3] Whatever might have been the difference with regard to the date of भट्टि, none was heard to suggest till 1922 that भट्टि was prior to भामह. In this year Dr. Jacobi[4] struck a new line of argument in determining the date of भामह. He tried to prove with all plausibility that भामह had drawn his material for the 5th chapter of काव्यालङ्कार from the न्यायबिन्दु of धर्मकीर्ति. This necessitated the placing of भामह after 650 A. C. Now भट्टि, as shown above, cannot be later than 650. So the learned scholars were compelled to look upon the *relation of* भट्टि *to* भामह from quite a different angle of vision. Dr. S. K. De, who, as far as we remember, never disagrees with Dr. Jacobi but always follows in his *foot steps, writes*[5]—" *At one time it* was believed, on the indication given by Jayamangala on Bhatti that the alamkāra-chapters in that काव्य especially

---

1. Introduction to his Edn of भट्टिकाव्य (B. S. S. No. LVI), P. XXII.

2. Introduction to his Edn. of साहित्यदर्पण, P. XVI.

3. For the discussions on the date of भट्टि, see also Dr. Jacobi-Z. D. M G., XLIV and also Sitz. d. Preuss. Akad d. Wiss. *1922, pp. 216-17 ; V. V.* Sovani—Bhandarkar commomoration Volume, p. 393; S. K De—History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol I. p. 50ff.

4. Sitz. d. Preuss Akad. d. Wiss., *No* XXIV, *pp-211-12.*

5. History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I *p. 50.*

canto X, was meant to illustrate the rhetorical teachings of Bhamaha in particular, but the date now assigned to Bhamaha (i e after धर्मकीर्ति's date 650), will re adjust his relation to Bhatti in a new light" The two learned doctors have taken great pains in 're adjusting भामह s relation to *भट्टि* *Re adjustment has been in the present* case nothing less than perfect reversion of the former position There is no use of examining on our part this 're adjustment' in all its details, for it has not been so much a child of *logic* as one of necessity The present case appears to us like that of a certain talented lawyer He once began to put forward arguments which might have been advanced by the other side When he was on the point of completing his arguments, he was made aware of his blunder by one of his colleagues He remained unmoved and at *once* addressed the court 'My Lords, such will be the arguments put forward by the other side Now I begin to refute them We wonder why the premises of the conclusion which upset the whole thing were not more carefully examined to see if there was some other alternative possible. Such cases of resemblance, corroboroted by the record of commentators and confirmed by the voice of tradition, as exist between the काव्यालङ्कार of भामह and the रावणवध of भट्टि, cannot be a matter of mere chance As we shall try to show later on भामह cannot be carried below 600 A C He may be much earlier So there is no necessity of putting the cart before the horse

दण्डी and भामह

Now we come to one of the most important parts of the discussion upon the date of भामह दण्डी, the auther of काव्यादर्श, has been very popular among the literati of mediaeval India, perhaps even to some extent more than भामह himself, who had the misfortune of having his work not

so easily available. On a close study of the works of these great poeticians, the impression becomes irresistible that they were related to each other, some way or other. There are some passages which are identical in the works of both, not only in sense but even in phraseology[1]. There are others, more important still, which appear to involve mutual criticism.[2] Besides, there are various views—either similar or dissimilar to one another—which clearly point to an intimate relation existing between the काव्यालङ्कार and काव्यादर्श[3] ।

These impressions, culled from the works of these two writers, led to the discussion of their chronological relation with each other. A sharp controversy ensued for settling the priority of one to the other. Mr. M. T. Narsimheingar raised this issue for the first time and was inclined to place दण्डी before भामह[4] He found his arguments very ably refuted by such eminent scholars as Mr. Trivedi[5], Dr. Jacobi[6], Prof. Rangacharya[7], Dr. Ganpati Śastri[8] and Prof. Pathak[9]. The last seems, however, to have changed his view later on[10]. As the majority of views appears to favour the priority of भामह, we need not encumber our humble paper with the statements of all views held either

1. Kane—Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, p. XXV ; De—History of Sanskrit Poetics, I. pp. 64-65.
2 De—History of Sanskrit Poetics, I. pp. 65-66.
3. Kane—Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, pp. XXV—XXXV.
4. J. R. A. S., 1905, pp. 535 ff.
5. Introduction to प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण pp. XXIII ff. ; Ind. Ant. XLII, ff. ; Bhandarkar Com. Vol., p. 40.
6. Z. D. M. G., LXIV, pp. 134 and 139.
7. Introduction to his edition of काव्यादर्श.
8. Introduction to स्वप्नवासवदत्त, p. XXV.
9 Introduction to कविराजमार्ग, p. 16
10. J B B.R A S , XXIII p 19, Ind. Ant XLI , p. 236 ff.

against or in favour of his priority Mr Kane has very cautiously collected the arguments of either side and those who feel interested may refer to his learned work[1] Mr Kane, after stating and examining all such views with admirable impartiality, has come to the conclusion that in reality no judgement is yet possible on the question one way or the other though from the character of the arguments employed he seems to be somewhat inclined in favour of दण्डी s priority to भामह He sums up his position thus ' It seems probable that भामह and दण्डी follow independent traditions the former having more affinity with the अलङ्कार school and the latter with भरत s school Whoever may be earlier, both are very near each other and are to be placed between 500 630 A C[2] Dr De has however, by forcibly re stating some cogent arguments, ably demonstrated that the majority view is the only best logical alternative[3]

We shall by way of concluding this portion of our paper, state one or two points which, to our mind, would conclusively show that भामह cannot be brought down to a period later than दण्डी Recently a book named अवन्तिसुन्दरीकथा has been discovered in the South by the Curator of the Madras Oriental MSS Library[4] It is evident from the said MS that it was written by दण्डी It is prefaced, as is usually done in कथाs, with a number of verses These verses include the praise of बाण and मयूर[5] along with that

1 Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, pp XXV—XXXV

2 Ibid p XXXV

3 History of Sanskrit Poetics Vol I pp 64—70

4 Proceedings and Transactions of the Second Oriental Conference, pp 193–201 Journal of the Mythic Society XIII, pp. 671–685

5 भिन्नस्तीक्ष्णमुखेनापि चित्र बाणेन निर्व्यथ ।
व्याहारेषु जहौ लीला न मयूर ॥

of many others. From this Poetic Introduction, we further learn that दण्डी was a great-grandson of भारवि who has been described here as a contemporary of kings दुर्विनीत and सिंहविष्णु. These monarchs were great ruling kings about 580 A.C. Thus it appears quite reasonable to infer that दण्डी, being fourth in descent from भारवि, must have belonged to the last quarter of the 7th or the begining of the 8th Century. This statement finds an additional support from the fact that दण्डी has not only praised बाणभट्ट but has narrated the story of कादम्बरी along with other episodes in his कथा and this narration seems to be an accurate reproduction of the tale as is found in the पूर्वार्द्ध of बाण's कादम्बरी. It is a well known fact that बाण belonged to the court of हर्षवर्धन who reigned from 606 to 648 A.C. A northern poet cannot be expected to have achieved in a decade or two, in those days of hard communication, so much fame as to merit such a high praise from a critic of the South.

It may be further shown on a most reliable authority that भामह must have lived before बाण. आनन्दवर्धन in his ध्वन्यालोक,[1] while asserting that the same idea, though already expressed by one poet, *appears new and charming* when put in a suggestive garb by another poet, points out a case where बाणभट्ट, drawing upon an idea expressed by भामह in one of his verses of काव्यालङ्कार, writes a prose

---

1. तथा चिरन्तनकाव्यबन्धेऽपि शब्दार्थगुणानुरणनरूपव्यङ्ग्यप्रकार-समाश्रयेण नव्यम् । यथा 'धरणीधारणायाधुना त्वं शेषः' (हर्षचरित VI para 15 of Kane's edition) इत्यादौ 'शेषो हिमगिरिस्त्वं च महान्तो गुरवः स्थिराः । यदलङ्घितमर्यादाश्चलन्तीं बिभृथ क्षितिम्' (काव्यालङ्कार III 27.) इत्यादौ सत्स्वपि सर्वथार्थानामुदयानुगमनरूपव्यङ्ग्यसमाश्रयेण नव्यम् ।—ध्वन्यालोक, उद्योत IV p.236.

passage in हर्षचरित It is quite clear from this that आनन्द-वर्धन had positive belief which must have been based on traditions prevalent among the Kāśmirian Pandits of his day that भामह was an old and popular predecessor of बाण so that the latter could safely and honourably borrow ideas from the former Hence unless this statement of आनन्दवर्धन *is shown to militate against the verdict of accepted* chronology bearing on the question (as is quite unlikely) the fact of भामह s priority can never be challenged

With due deference to those who hold that भामह and दण्डी are chronologically very near to and not far removed from each other, we may be permitted to observe here, in passing, that to us it does not appear to be the fact भामह most probably *belonged to Kaśmir and* दण्डी *undoubtedly* hailed from the South It cannot be imagined that the writers so far removed could vie with each other in those days It cannot be denied that दण्डी, with an evident criticising mood, tries to eclipse the work of भामह by his own This case is somewhat like भारवि and माघ who though not *far removed in space, were, in time, far away from each other* This point can be further borne out by the linguistic evidence The प्राकृतs had not, perhaps, been so much in vogue in the time of भामह as they were in the time of दण्डी Perhaps सेतुबन्ध which finds such a high and merited *eulogy from* दण्डी had not yet been written भामह makes no linguistic division of काव्य as दण्डी does If it could be proved that the प्राकृतमनोरमा, the oldest commentary on वररुचि s प्राकृतप्रकाश, was from the pen of this very भामह, the author of काव्यालङ्कार, it might be held to have been *the oldest work on Prakrit Grammar,* next only to वररुचि, the author of the सूत्रs it comments upon In this connection it may be pointed out that the later महाराष्ट्री—not to say

the other dialects—does not wholly conform to the rules of वररुचि as explained by भामह and that the later commentators, वसन्तराज and others, have tried to explain the सूत्रs in a much more comprehensive way. Howsoever it may be, it is undoubtedly clear that the picture of society found in the work of भामह—faintly drawn though it may be—can be clearly distinguished from what we find depicted in the काव्यादर्श of दण्डी. The poetic luminaries so familiar to the eyes of भामह's age had, by the time of दण्डी, totally disappeared from the horizon. The elegant simplicity of the earlier Muse had not as yet hardened into sentimental ideas and artistic expressions. The sharp controversies ranging between the Buddhists and the Hindus in the time of भामह, had led to the study of the science and art of Polemics, so that even a work on Poetics was expected to take the topics into consideration. But the atmosphere seems to have wholly changed by the time of दण्डी. The heroes of popular stories were yet fresh in the memory of the people. Coming to the field of Poetics itself, we find not a few points of contrast along with those of similarity in the works of these two authors There is no use enlarging upon this topic, for, it can become obvious to even a casual reader of the said works. We feel, therefore, inclined to believe that भामह was seperated from दण्डी not by decades but by centuries.

भामह and धर्मकीर्ति.

We have shown above that on the evidence of आनन्दवर्धन in ध्वन्यालोक, भामह cannot be placed later than बाण who flourished in the first half of the 7th century; but this view is seriously challenged by the hypothesis that भामह has borrowed some logical topics from धर्मकीर्ति. Dr. Jacobi has discussed this point at some length and in

that connection has considered the date of धर्मकीर्ति. He places धर्मकीर्ति between the sojourns in India of Houen Tsang and of Itsing. The former who travelled between 630 and 643 makes no reference to the Buddhist Logician The latter, travelling between 671 to 695, seems clearly to have heard of him. Tāranātha[1] makes धर्मकीर्ति a contemporary of the Tibetan King Sron tsan-gam po who lived during 627-698 A. C. So the middle of the seventh century may be fairly taken to be the date of धर्मकीर्ति If, however, it could be proved, as Jacobi has tried to do, that भामह had actually utilised the logical work of धर्मकीर्ति, the statement of आनन्दवर्धन would considerably lose in value and भामह would consequently have the chance of being dragged down to the 8th century at least. Let us first examine the arguments put forward therefor.

All the arguments put forward for establishing the indebtedness of भामह to धर्मकीर्ति are based upon a few points of similarity existing in their works[2]. They are only three. Let us take them one by one. भामह has given two definitions of अनुमान—

> त्रिरूपाल्लिङ्गतो ज्ञानमनुमानं च केचन ।
> तद्विदो नान्तरीयार्थदर्शनं चापरे विदुः ॥ काव्या० V 11

Now we know from the तात्पर्यटीका of वाचस्पतिमिश्र upon न्यायवार्तिक that the definition of अनुमान, as given here in the second half of the śloka, came originally from दिङ्नाग[3]. But what are we to say about the first difinition ? " Die

1 See Vidyābhūṣaṇa's History of Indian Logic, pp 305-6

2. See Dr. Jacobi's 'Bhāmaha und Daṇḍin ihr Alter und ihre Stellung in der indischen Poetic' in Sitz. d. Preuss Akad d Wiss., XXIV, 1922, pp 211-212.

3. See Dr. Randle's 'Fragments from Dinnāga,' pp 21-22.

erste der beiden von Bhāmaha gegeben Definitionen", writes Dr. Jacobi, "mutz also von einem andern Philosophen herrühren". And who is that another philosopher? It is धर्मकीर्ति—says Dr. Jacobi, for, at one place of his न्यायबिन्दु, we read अनुमानं द्विधा स्वार्थं परार्थं च, तत्र स्वार्थं त्रिरूपाल्लिङ्गाद् यदनुमेये ज्ञानं तदनुमानम् ।

In this case as well as in the cases following, the question, which we are to put to ourselves, should be whether a particuliar view— लिङ्गस्य त्रैरूप्यम् for instance—is peculiar with someone or is common to many. Such an argument can have any weight only when the view concerned is original. Unfortunately we do not find any such thing in the present case. लिङ्गस्य त्रैरूप्यम् is a too well-known thing with our नैयायिकs to have originated with धर्मकीर्ति. It is quite sufficient for our purpose here to show that it was known even to दिङ्नाग. Thanks to the labours of the late lamented Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇa, we can have some knowledge of दिङ्नाग's works. दिङ्नाग *in* his प्रमाणसमुच्चय spoke of स्वार्थानुमान thus[1]: An inference for one's self (svārthānumāna, raṅ-don-gyi-rjes-dpag) is defined as the knowledge of a thing derived through its mark or sign of three characters. Will it not, when turned into Sanskrit, read somewhat exactly like the extract from न्यायबिन्दु of धर्मकीर्ति cited above? In this connection we are to note one thing more. The way in which भामह gives this definition along with that of दिङ्नाग, does not only show that it came from some other source, but also to the fact that it formed an earlier and more commonly accepted view. Besides प्रमाणसमुच्चय, we have a clear description of लिङ्गस्य त्रैरूप्यम् in न्यायप्रवेश.[2] Whoever might be the

---

1. See Dr. Vidyābhūṣana's History of Indian Logic, p. 280

2. This work has been so long known *only through* Tibetan

author of this work,[1] none has so far tried to prove that it was written after धर्मकीर्ति Thus we see that भामह was not in any way indebted to धर्मकीर्ति for his knowledge of लिङ्गस्य त्रैरूप्यम् We are very much inclined to think that he had not to thank even दिङ्नाग for, at least, this section of Indian Logic He might have probably derived his knowledge from some earlier logician

The other statement of भामह which has been said to correspond with that of धर्मकीर्ति is दूषण न्यूनताद्युक्ति (काव्या० V 28) धर्मकीर्ति has दूषणानि न्यूनताद्युक्ति[2] । The similarity is indeed striking But the question again comes up Is it an original idea of धर्मकीर्ति ? The same question may be raised with regard to the third corresponding statement of भामह—जातयो दूषणाभासा (काव्या० V 29) Does धर्मकीर्ति propound a new theory when he says दूषणाभासास्तु जातय[3] ? In both the above cases, धर्मकीर्ति does not appear to have anything peculiar to himself The दूषणs and जातिs have been known to earlier writers

---

Texts Fortunately it is now going to be published by Principal A B Dhruva in the Gaekwad Oriental Series We owe our knowledge of it to the kindness of Principal Dhruva

For the three characteristics of the Middle Term (लिङ्गस्य त्रैरूप्यम्) as found in न्यायप्रवेश see History of Indian Logic p 291

1 The question is a mooted one We postpone its discussion for the time being

2 न्यायबिन्दु, (Peterson s Edn) III 138
Benares Edn reads दूषणा न्यूनताद्युक्ति See p 132

3 न्यायबिन्दु, Peterson s Edn III 140 Benares Edn p 133

as well[1]. In न्यायप्रवेश we have similar descriptions of दूषणs and जातिs[2]

Mr. P. V. Kāne[3], who, as has been noted before, pointed out the similarity existing between the works of भामह and धर्मकीर्ति, quite independently of Dr. Jacobi, has cited another śloka from भामह's काव्यालङ्कार, appearing somewhat exactly like a passage in धर्मकीर्ति's न्यायबिन्दु. भामह's śloka reads thus ;

> सत्त्वादय. प्रमाणाभ्यां प्रत्यक्षमनुमा च ते ।
> असाधारणसामान्यविषयत्वं तयोः किल ॥ काव्या०-V. 5

धर्मकीर्ति writes thus

द्विविधं सम्यग्ज्ञानं प्रत्यक्षमनुमानं च (p 10). तस्य विषयः स्वलक्षणं (p. 21) .....अन्यत् सामान्यलक्षणं (p 24) सोऽनुमानस्य विषयः (p. 25) Now it may be again pointed out here that this division and definition of प्रमाणs has not originated with धर्मकीर्ति । Almost all the logicians who were opposed to अक्षपाद (who propounded four प्रमाणs) had mostly a similar view दिङ्नाग, for instance, in his प्रमाणसमुच्चय (ch 1) states that pramāṇas are only two, *viz*, perception and inference All objects being known through them, there is no other प्रमाण । Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇa has restored the Sanskrit original thus

---

1. They are too well-known to require much argumentation for establishing their existence before धर्मकीर्ति In this connection it will be, however, interesting to refer to a न्यायसूत्र of गौतम (1-2 18) and वात्स्यायन's भाष्य thereon The sutra is साधर्म्यवैधर्म्याभ्यां प्रत्यवस्थानं जातिः । वात्स्यायन comments upon it thus :—प्रयुक्ते हि हेतौ यः प्रसङ्गो जायते सा जातिः । स च प्रसङ्गः साधर्म्यवैधर्म्याभ्यां प्रत्यवस्थानमुपालम्भ. प्रतिषेध इति । प्रत्यनीकभावाज्जायमानोऽर्थो जातिरिति ।

2 See Vidyabhusana's History of Indian Logic, p 298

3 Introduction to his Edn of साहित्यदर्पण, p XL

प्रत्यक्षमनुमानं च प्रमाणं हि द्विलक्षणम् ।
प्रमेयं तत्र सिद्धं हि न प्रमाणान्तरं भवेत् ॥

It will be seen from the above that all those passages from धर्मकीर्ति, which have been cited as originals of भामह's ślokas, have no originality with themselves They represent views which were quite well known even before the birth of the Buddhist logician Under such circumstances one cannot safely argue that भामह was indebted to धर्मकीर्ति and to nobody else Dr Jacobi is not such a superficial scholar as to be convinced of भामह s indebtedness to धर्मकीर्ति simply upon the basis of accidental similarity of views We presume that it was the partial similarity of phraseology too which led him to entertain such a view But to our mind, the similarity of phraseology in the present case is not so very significant Striking similarity is seen only in the sentences which deal with दूषणs and जातिs. But there again, we cannot say that धर्मकीर्ति was the first person to use them With equal force, we may say that it was भामह who wrote them first of all We see no absurdity in it If शान्तरक्षित, philosopher as he was, did not find it inconvenient to repeat the phraseology of our poetician, we see no reason why धर्मकीर्ति would not do the some, if he could find something handy, cut and dried, from him

What we want to emphasise very particularly is simply this that the similarity of phraseology even if it could be proved to exist beyond doubt, will not by itself be of much use. In such a case there are three alternatives possible, each of which being equally tenable Now with regard to the topic in question, unless and until more definite evidence is forthcoming, none can be justified in claiming that भामह borrowed views and phraseology from धर्मकीर्ति It may be

equally cogent to say that धर्मकीर्ति was indebted to भामह or both of them had utilised some common source.

As far as we are aware, Dr. Jacobi did not point out any other line of evidence which could further support his assumption. "Diese Entlehungen Bhāmahas" says the great orientalist, "aus Dharmakīrtis Nyāyabindu beweisen, dass er jünger als dieser, wenn auch vielleicht nur ein jüngerer Zeitgenosse desselben, war". But how has the indebtedness of भामह been proved? There he writes thus: "Nun lautet Dharmakīrtis Definition, Nyāyabindu II. 3: tatra trirūpālliṅgād yad anumeye jñānaṃ, tad anumānaṃ so ähnlich der Bhāmaha von gegebenen, dass kaum noch ein Zweifel darüber bestehen kann, woher letzterer sie genommen hat. Noch deutlicher zeigen uns das Bhāmaha Definitionen der dūṣaṇas und der jātis in V. 28." This is the sum and substance of all his statements in this connection. We really wonder how such a veteran scholar as Dr. Jacobi, with such faulty and inadequate premises, could jump to such a momentous conclusion. Mr. P. V. Kāne, with characteristic cautiousness of a lawyer, did not, though suggesting the same line of argument, commit himself in any way. He is perhaps more inclined to suggest भामह's indebtedness to दिङ्नाग, if he could only prove it. It is gratifying to note that Dr. Jacobi's hypothesis is not now meeting with that universal approbation which it was at first expected to do. It has been called in question by Dr J. Nobel[2] and quietly ignored by Dr. B. Bhaṭṭāchārya[3].

---

1 See his Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, p. XL.

2. 'Die Avantisundarikathā', Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistic, Bd. V, p. 150

3. Foreword to शान्तरक्षित's तत्त्वसङ्ग्रह (G O. S. XXX), pp. LXXIX—LXXX.

The best way for determining whether भामह was indebted to धर्मकीर्ति or not would have been perhaps the comparison of भामह's views with the peculiar views of धर्मकीर्ति It is known to all who know anything of mediaeval logic that धर्मकीर्ति, though a follower of दिङ्नाग, did not adopt his views *in toto* The peculiarities of धर्मकीर्ति have been carefully noted by Dr Vidyabhusana[1] and a reference to these will surely make it clear that no special view of the Buddhist logician has been represented in the work of भामह On the contrary there are indications which point diametrically to the opposite side We may just refer to some of them The definition of प्रत्यक्ष, as given by दिङ्नाग, is प्रत्यक्षं कल्पनापोढम्[2] । To this an important addition is made by धर्मकीर्ति by saying प्रत्यक्षं कल्पनापोढमभ्रान्तम्[3] Now the term अभ्रान्त is not such as can be ignored by any person coming after him दिङ्नाग's definition was rather too general and consequently could be interpreted to apply to everything so that everything will be प्रत्यक्ष उद्योतकर did actually interpret it in this way[4] To avoid this contingency धर्मकीर्ति added अभ्रान्त which made it clear that by प्रत्यक्ष, we were to mean here प्रत्यक्षज्ञान and nothing else Who will indulge in such an inexactitude

---

1 See Vidyabhusana's History of Indian Logic pp 315—318

2 वाचस्पतिमिश्र in his तात्पर्यटीका, while commenting upon 'अपरे तु मन्यन्ते प्रत्यक्षं कल्पनापोढमिति' begins सम्प्रति दिङ्नागस्य लक्षणमुपन्यस्यति अपर इति । See also Vidyabhusana's History of Indian Logic pp 276—277 and Dr Randle's Fragments from Dinnaga pp 8—10

3 See न्यायबिन्दु (Benares Edn) p 11

4 He takes it as स्वरूपतो न व्यपदेश्यम् ।

when once it has been so pointed out? भामह gives two definitions of प्रत्यक्ष in a single line. It is—

प्रत्यक्षं कल्पनापोढं ततोऽर्थादिति केचन—काव्या० V.6.

one of the two definitions—the first of them—belongs, on the authority of वाचस्पति मिश्र, to दिङ्नाग and the second, on the same authority, to वसुबन्धु[1], the teacher of दिङ्नाग. Now can it be imagined that भामह could have afforded to leave out धर्मकीर्ति's definition, had he been aware of it? Besides, कल्पना is defin.d by धर्मकीर्ति in a strikingly different way. According to him कल्पना is अभिलापसंसर्गयोग्यप्रतिभास-प्रतीतिः[2]. But उद्योतकर, while discussing दिङ्नाग's definition of प्रत्यक्ष, says: 'अथ केयं कल्पना? नामजातियोजनेति। यत् किल न नाम्नाभिधीयते न च जात्यादिभिर्व्यपदिश्यते।'[3] वाचस्पति-मिश्र calls it लक्षणवादिनामुत्तरम्[4]. Now the लक्षणवादीs must be दिङ्नाग and all those who had a similar view. We may presume that भामह was also one of them—at least conversant with the view—for he says कल्पनां नामजात्यादियोजनां प्रति-जानते-काव्या० V.6 It may be admitted that धर्मकीर्ति's definition of कल्पना is more academic in tone exactly as his definition of प्रत्यक्ष is more exact in expression. If भामह could afford to give two views on an important issue, he would not, we think, mind to give a third one also, if it was more useful and suitable, as धर्मकीर्ति's definitions indeed are.

---

1. वाचस्पतिमिश्र begins his comment upon 'अपरे पुनर्वर्णयन्ति ततोऽर्थाद् विज्ञानं प्रत्यक्षम्। तदेवं प्रत्यक्षलक्षणं समर्थ्य वासुबन्धवं तावत् प्रत्यक्षलक्षणं विकल्पयितुमुपन्यस्यति-ता० p. 99. See also Dr. Randle's Fragments from Dinnāga, p.12—13.

2. न्यायबिन्दु, p. 13.

3. न्यायवार्तिक, p. 44.

4. तात्पर्यटीका, p. 102.

One thing more should be noted in this connection As far as we know धर्मकीर्ति has nowhere in his extant works shown any regard to the views of वसुबन्धु though his pupil, दिङ्नाग, is his great authoritative source But भामह has referred to the views of the older logician in unmistakable language May we not assume with probability that, by the time of धर्मकीर्ति, वसुबन्धु had been somewhat eclipsed by his decidedly abler pupil? It is quite possible that भामह lived in an age when वसुबन्धु was not so forgotten He still commanded respectful attention from scholars along with दिङ्नाग

It will be undoubtedly quite profitable to give here the results of a detailed comparison of these works but we are afraid the space at our disposal will not permit it We may, in passing just note a few points भामह has six पक्षाभासs[1] but धर्मकीर्ति has only four[2] If we were to look into न्यायप्रवेश we shall find no less than nine[3] But what is very interesting to note is that some of the definitions and examples of भामह wholly correspond with those in न्यायप्रवेश । दृष्टान्त is included by धर्मकीर्ति in त्रिरूपहेतु[4] but भामह takes it separately[5] exactly as we find it in न्यायप्रवेश and प्रमाणसमुच्चय। In न्यायप्रवेश and प्रमाणसमुच्चय we further find दृष्टान्त divided into two classes according to the way they are possible either by साधर्म्य or वैधर्म्य[6] । This is also the case with भामह । But धर्मकीर्ति has

---

1 काव्यालङ्कार, v 13 20

2 न्यायबिन्दु, pp 84 85

3 न्यायप्रवेश—See in the History of Indian Logic pp 290 291

4 त्रिरूपो हेतुरुक्तः । तावतैवार्थप्रतीतिरिति न पृथग् दृष्टान्तो नाम साधनावयवः कश्चित् । तेन नास्य लक्षणं पृथगुच्यते—न्यायबिन्दु, p 117

5 काव्यालङ्कार, v 21, v 26-27

6 History of Indian Logic, pp 286-7, 295—6 In these

7

no such division. The few points, noted above, are quite sufficient to convince any unprejudiced person that भामह's borrowing from धर्मकीर्ति is any thing but possible.

Even if these points were not available, we could have shown that भामह's coming after धर्मकीर्ति cannot be imagined. धर्मकीर्ति, as shown above, lived about 650 A. C. and hailed from the South of India. शान्तरक्षित lived in Bengal in the beginning of the 8th century. Now, we cannot, with any stretch of our imagination, conceive that within half a century such a progress could be possible in those days of hard communication. धर्मकीर्ति becomes sufficiently famous, his works are carried to Kashmir, there भामह utilises them for writing his own work, then he also becomes well-known, his work reaches Bengal and is devoured by शान्तरक्षित—and all this was accomplished within half a century ! It seems to be hardly possible. We have no reason, therefore, to doubt आनन्दवर्द्धन's statement that बाण was acquainted with भामह's work, so that 600 A.C. can be safely taken to be the lower limit of भामह's date.

But what should be his upper limit ? The fore-going discussion has shown that भामह was familiar with the views, which are, on the authority of वाचस्पतिमिश्र, ascribed to दिङ्नाग । We have further shown that his views sometimes correspond with those which are found in न्यायप्रवेश । Nanjio[1] and Takakusu[2] ascribe this work to नागार्जुन । But *Pandit Vidhusekhara Bhaṭṭāchārya thinks that Nanjio* " has

---

cases resemblance in phraseology is also to be noted. धर्मकीर्ति has, however, got such a division in दृष्टान्ताभास.

1. Nanjio's Catalogue of the Chinese Tripitaka, p. 270, Nos. 1223, 1224.

2. A Record of the Buddhist Religion by Itsing, pp. 177, 186.

made a mistake in rendering the name into Sanskrit The name, as given in Chinese in the book itself, is Yü lun, the Sanskrit equivalent of which is Dinnaga [1] But, according to Sugiura[2] and Ui,[3] न्यायप्रवेश is attributed by the Chinese tradition to शङ्करस्वामी। दिङ्नाग's work, according to this view, was न्यायद्वार, quite distinct from न्यायप्रवेश Dr Randle[4] sees 'no reason to doubt the correctness of the Chinese attribution of the न्यायद्वार to Dinnaga That being the case, it is impossible that Dinnaga should have been the author of न्यायप्रवेश But we see no reason to doubt the correctness of the Tibetan attribution of the न्यायप्रवेश to दिङ्नाग। If that be the case, it is impossible that any other person but दिङ्नाग should have been the author of the न्यायप्रवेश। Besides many cogent arguments so ably put forward by Pandit Vidhuśekhara Bhattacharya[5] for proving that न्यायप्रवेश was the work of दिङ्नाग, one thing appears to turn the scale to a very great extent It is a curious fact that शङ्करस्वामी was not known to either Houen Tsang or Itsing The Tibetan texts are quite ignorant of his name The Tibetan translation of the Chinese translation of न्यायप्रवेश clearly shows that at that time even the Chinese did not know of शङ्करस्वामी। It is really inexplicable how they came, later on to associate his name with न्यायप्रवेश। There seems to be some baffling confusion lurking somewhere or other Unless and until this mystery is cleared up, we shall not know the real ground of its attribution by the

1 'The Nyaya Pravesa of Dinnaga Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol III, p 154

2 Hindu Logic as preserved in China and Japan pp 36–37

3 Vaiśeṣika Philosophy, p. 68

4 Fragments from Dinnāga, p 61

5 Indian Historical Quarterly Vol III pp 154–159

Chinese to शङ्करस्वामी। But so far as the Tibetan Text,[1] as edited by Pandit Vidhuśekhara Bhaṭṭāchārya, is concerned, it is more than probable that it is the work of दिङ्नाग। The learned editor has compared it with the Chinese and Sanskrit Versions and does not perhaps find material difference between them. So what is said of the Tibetan version with regard to its authorship, may be, therefore, true of other versions as well.[2] We have every hope that this puzzling enigma will be cleared up by Principal Dhruva's Introduction to the Sanskrit Version of the न्यायप्रवेश[3]।

It does not, however, matter much for us even if शङ्करस्वामी was to be proved the author of न्यायप्रवेश। He is said to have been the pupil of दिङ्नाग and consequently must have been his younger contemporary. So when we find clear resemblance of certain views and expressions in भामह's work from the works of दिङ्नाग and न्यायप्रवेश, we can, without hesitation, say that दिङ्नाग's date will furnish the upper limit to भामह's age.

The date of दिङ्नाग depends upon the date of his teacher, वसुबन्धु। Nanjio informs us that कुमारजीव wrote a life of वसुबन्धु[4] between A. C. 401 and 409 and परमार्थ, who lived between A C 499 and 560, wrote another.[5] From

1. Gaekwad Oriental Series, XXXIX Part II.

2. Dr. N. D Mironov contributes a paper on 'Diṅnāga's Nyāya Praveśa and Haribhadra's commentary on it,' to the volume presented to Dr. Garbe. We have not as yet seen it, but from the title we may assume that he is also inclined to attribute न्यायप्रवेश to दिङ्नाग।

3. G. O. S. XXXIX Part I.

4. Nanjio's Catalogue of the Chinese Tripitaka, app. I. 64.

5. Ibid No. 1463.

परमार्थ[1] we know that वसुबन्धु was a contemporary of विक्रमादित्य, who is identified by V A. Smith[2] with Chandra Gupta I of the Gupta Dynasty If this line of argument is followed, as has been done by V A Smith[3] and M Peri[4], वसुबन्धु, who died, it is said, at the age of 80, will be found to have been living between 280 360 A C But unfortunately all scholars are not at one Different scholars assign different dates to वसुबन्धु। The other most important view is that which places him between 420—500 A C[5] But the majority of the scholars[6] appears to be inclined towards the former view Undoubtedly that view appears, to say the least, much more probable If we were to subscribe to the other view, the whole subsequent chronology becomes awfully disturbed. Then we have to look upon कुमारजीव's 'Life of Vasubandhu as a myth and disbelieve the traditions which make वसुबन्धु one of the Patriarchs and his work as having been translated into Chinese by कुमारजीव।

So we have seen above that there is every probability of वसुबन्धु having lived between 280 and 360 A C Now दिङ्नाग, being his pupil, must have been his junior contemporary and so must have lived somewhere before 400 Now, if 400 A C is to be the approximate date of दिङ्नाग, that date must also be considered to furnish the upper limit to भामह's date We may, therefore, safely say

---

1 Takakusu, J R A S, 1905, p 44
2 Early History of India, 3rd Edn, p 320
3 Ibid, pp 328 ff
4 Bull de l Ecole francaise d Extreme-orient, XI 355 ff
5 Vidyābhusana s History of Indian Logic, pp 266—267
6 Keith—Indian Logic and Atomism, p 98, Buddhist Philosophy p 155, B Bhattacharya s Foreword to तत्त्वसंग्रह (G O S XXX) pp LXVI—LXXX

that भामह must have lived between the dates of दिङ्नाग and बाण viz , between 400 and 600 A C

If we wish to be a little more exact with regard to the date of भामह, we should try to find out whether he was nearer to दिङ्नाग or to धर्मकीर्ति । We have already shown that his views correspond much more with those of दिङ्नाग than those of धर्मकीर्ति । We have further shown that he was living in an age when the old teachers were not as yet forgotten This fact can be further borne out by a careful comparison of his work with the extant works of those teachers At some places he has referred the reader for details to other works which are not found perhaps in दिङ्नाग s works We have further to take into consideration that भामह s fame must have taken some time for becoming *so much ripe as to induce a poet of Kanouj as* बाण *indeed* was, to become acquainted with the work of the great Kashmirian If we may be permitted to allow a century for it, we shall be, we think, not wrong in placing भामह before 500 A C But the way he writes the atmosphere he breathes the company he keeps,—all these leave us still unsatisfied We are very much tempted to think that he was not far removed from दिङ्नाग, though we cannot positively prove it by direct evidence The fifth chapter of his काव्यालङ्कार, teeming so much with philosophical logic, rather smacking much more as it were, of polemics, makes us believe that he was living in an age which was permeated with debate and controversy in every quarter Such a period in Indian History was possible only with such scholars as दिङ्नाग । We know from accounts[1], preserved here and

---

1 Lama Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus von Schiefner, pp 130—135 Vidyābhūṣaṇa's History of Indian Logic, pp. 272-274

there, that the great आचार्य spent his whole life in vehement शास्त्रार्थ—heated controversy and debate He was known in his times as तर्कपुङ्गव or a fighting bull But such an age did not last for a long time By the time of दण्डी, न्यायनिर्णय or settling the logic of poetry, which was considered so very necessary an appendage in a work on Poetics by भामह, came to be considered as a useless कर्कशविचार[1] । Even in the time of बाण, we find no indication of the continuation of दिङ्नाग s age of passionate debate and heated controversy Further, no indication to that effect has been furnished even by the 5th and 6th century inscriptions of the Guptas Thus we are not far wrong in believing that that age of controversy almost came to an end with दिङ्नाग । Hence we may conclude that भामह was either a contemporary of or came immediately after दिङ्नाग who, we know, became widely known throughout the country on account of his incessant wanderings on controversy tours [2] Consequently we may state that भामह was, with all probability living about 400 A C or, if न्यायप्रवेश happens to be proved the work of शंकरस्वामी, a few years later

भामह's WORKS

It is indeed very difficult—if not wholly impossible—to determine whether our author had written any other work besides the well known काव्यालङ्कार । We find, no doubt, the name of भामह associated with certain quotations which are not traceable in the काव्यालङ्कार । राघवभट्ट, in his commentary, अर्थद्योतनिका, on अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तल quotes twice in the name of भामह extracts which are nowhere to be found in the काव्यालङ्कार । One of them appears to have

---

1 विचार कर्कश प्रायस्तेनालीढेन किं फलम्—काव्यादर्श

2 Tāranātha s Geschichte des Buddhismus von Schiefner

been taken from a work on Metrics[1] and the other from some work on Poetics[2] The latter sentence, curiously enough, is met with, with slight modifications in the अलङ्कारसारसंग्रह of उद्भट and its example in काव्यप्रकाश । Some slokas are quoted by नारायणभट्ट in his commentary on वृत्तरत्नाकर in the name of भामह । These seem to have been taken from a work on Metrics[3]

---

1. क्षेमं सर्वगुरुर्दत्ते मगणो भूमिदैवतः इति भामहोक्तेः p. 4. (नि० सा० edition).

2. तल्लक्षणमुक्तं भामहेन—पर्यायोक्तं प्रकारेण यदन्येनाभिधीयते । वाच्यवाचकशक्तिभ्यां शून्येनावगमात्मना । इति । उदाहृतं च हयग्रीववधस्थं पद्यं 'यं प्रेक्ष्य चिररूढापि निवासप्रीतिरुज्झिता । मदेनैरावणमुखे मानेन हृदये हरे.' इति । p. 10.

3. तदुक्तं भामहेन—

    अवर्णात् सम्पत्तिर्भवति मुदिवर्णाद्धनदाता-
    न्युवर्गाद्ख्याति. सरभसमृवर्णाद्विरहितात् ।
    तथा ऐचः सौख्यं ङञणरहितादक्षरगणात्
    पदादौ विन्यासात् भरनदलहाहाविरहितात् ॥

वृत्तरत्नाकर, p. 6 (Benares Edition).

तदुक्तं भामहेनैव—

    देवतावाचका. शब्दा ये च भद्रादिवाचकाः ।
    ते सर्वे नैव निन्द्याः स्युर्लिपितो गणतोऽपि वा ॥
    कं खो गो घश्च लक्ष्मीं वितरति वियशो ङस्तथा चः सुखं छः
    प्रीतिं जो मित्रलाभं भयमरणकरौ झञौ टठौ खेददुःखे ।
    डः शोभां ढो विशोभां भ्रमणमथ च णस्तः सुखं थश्च युद्धं
    दो धः सौख्यं मुदं नः [illegible] पवर्गः ॥
    यो लक्ष्मीं रश्च दाहं व्यसनमथ लवौ शः सुखं षश्च खेदं
    सः सौख्यं हश्च खेदं विलयमपि च [illegible] समृद्धिं करोति ।
    [illegible] चेह न स्यात् [illegible]गणदुर्वर्णविन्यासयोगः
    पद्यादौ गद्यमुखे वर्णनि च [illegible] प्राकृतादौ क्रमोऽयम् ॥

वृत्तरत्नाकर p. 7.

Besides these extracts, coming down to us in the name of भामह, presumably taken from works now wholly lost, we have a well known commentary on प्राकृतप्रकाश, the Prakrit Grammar written in sutras by वररुचि It is called प्राकृतमनोरमा and is considered to be the oldest commentry now extant[1]

We have no direct evidence to prove or disprove that it was the author of काव्यालङ्कार who wrote the works referred to above Who can say if there were not several persons bearing the same common appellation? But it is not every person bearing a similar name who is equally famous The author of the प्राकृतमनोरमा, however, has been identified by somewith the writer of काव्यालङ्कार Dr Pischel[2] following Peterson[3] did not even doubt, that the two भामहs might be different He says—' Der älteste commentator is Bhamaha, ein Kaschmirer, der auch Rhetor und Dichter war As far as we can see, their opinion seems to have been based upon the hearsay of the Pandits Howsoever reliable their views may be we would very much wish that they were backed by historical evidence so that they could be pronounced as perfectly definite But it appears at the same time simply impossible to believe that such a versatile scholar as the author of काव्यालङ्कार seems to have been could have remained perfectly idle before or after the writing of his brilliant work on Rhetoric So, in a word, we do not find ourselves in a position to pronounce any definite opinion either this way or that way

---

1 Pischel s Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen, p 35

2 Ibid.

3 सुभाषितावली, p 79 See also Aufrecht s Catalogus Catalogorum and Pischel s Rudrata p, 6 f

काव्यालङ्कार.

We wish very much that we could discuss thoroughly and examine critically the learned and interesting contents of the काव्यालङ्कार, but the consideration of space does *not* permit us to enlarge upon this topic at any great length. It is enough to remember here that भामह has divided his work into six परिच्छेद्s or sections treating of five topics. They are as under—

1. काव्यशरीर. To this section 60 verses have been devoted. They dispose of a few general questions about poetry, its use, definition, etc ;

2. अलङ्कारs. This topic consists of the definitions and illustrations of the Figures of Speech. It is interesting to meet here with a few names of poets who are now wholly unknown. This portion covers 160 verses ;

3. दोषs. Here भामह discusses the demerits of poetic compositions in 50 verses ;

4. न्यायनिर्णय—Here he tries to settle the logical foundation of poetry. Really speaking, this section and the section following form parts of the discussions on the demerits of compositions But as Logic and Grammar appear to have been reigning supreme in his days, the author was led to devote, unlike many others, special sections to them. This section has for its share 70 verses ;

5 शब्दशुद्धि—Here the author tries to instruct the would be poets to take care of and avoid the grammatical mistakes which are ever so prone to creep in. This section has 60 verses[1]

---

1. भामह himself has summed up the whole thing at the end of his काव्यालङ्कार—

षष्ट्या शरीरं निर्णीतं शतषष्ट्या त्वलङ्कृतिः।
पञ्चाशता दोषदृष्टिः सप्तत्या न्यायनिर्णयः॥

भामह—His Place in the History of Sanskrit Poetics

We have seen, at the very outset, in what a great esteem भामह has all along been held by almost all the great writers on Sanskrit Poetics He is found quoted in the works of उद्भट, वामन, कुन्तक, आनन्दवर्धन, अभिनवगुप्त, मम्मट and many others of different times and divergent views With equal regard he has been often referred to by such writers of eminence as the authors of अलङ्कारसर्वस्व, प्रतापरुद्रीय, एकावली and others[1] This fact cannot but rouse a sense of inquisitiveness in our hearts to study the work of भामह as thoroughly as to find out his merits of such a stable and enduring attraction But this is not an easy thing as it will necessitate a thorough review of the important Ālaṁkārika works for comparison as well as for tracing their indebtedness to our poetician But the consideration of this topic may find a fitting place in a History of Sanskrit Poetics and not in a paper like this All that we can do is to take a brief historical survey of our subject and determine as correctly as possible the place occupied therein by भामह ।

षष्ट्या शब्दस्य शुद्धिः स्यादित्येवं वस्तुपञ्चकम् ।
उक्तं षड्भिः परिच्छेदैर्भामहेन क्रमेण वः ॥

For the detailed description of the contents, see Kane's Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, pp XVI-XVII, for a critical review of the contents the reader is referred to Trivedi's excellent paper 'Some Notes on Bhāmaha" in Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume and Dr De s History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol II, pp 401—412

1 For such details see Trivedi s article in Indian Antiquary, Vol XLII (1913) and also his Introduction to प्रतापरुद्र यशोभूषण

The worship of सरस्वती—the service of the Poetic Muse—has been from very early times one of the favourite hobbies of the Aryan people. Even the oldest attempt at poetry by the primeval ancestors of the human race—the ऋग्वेद्—contains many sparkling gems of genuine poetry. It appears that the Aryans had undoubtedly an artistic conception of poetry from the very beginning, for we meet even in the earliest poems, with expressions of such exquisite aesthetic charm as have been later on elaborately treated of in the works of Poetics as अलङ्कारs or figures of speech[1].

We find a treatment of उपमा in the निरुक्त of यास्क[2], who, at one place, refers to a quite workable definition of this figure given by गार्ग्य[3]। यास्क gives further such divisions of उपमा[4] which seem to have been the fore-runners of the subtle distinctions made later on. By the time of पाणिनि such technical words as उपमान, उपमेय etc. had become perfectly well-established[5]. We find further a reference to

---

1. See ऋग्वेद् I. 124. 7; I. 164. 20; I. 164. 11. See also कठोपनिषत् I. 3 3. and मुण्डकोपनिषत् II 2 3. Besides these, we may also refer to the several hymns containing charming dialogues, known as संवाद् hymns found in the ऋग्वेद्. See especially X. 108; III. 33. These hymns have been considered as the fore-runners of the Sanskrit Drama by Dr. Oldenberg and others.

2. I. 4; III. 13-18; IX. 6

3. अथात उपमा यदतत् तत्सदृशमिति गार्ग्यः। तदासां कर्म ज्यायसा वा गुणेन प्रख्याततमेन वा कनीयांसं वाप्रख्यातं वोपमिमीते, अथापि कनीयसा ज्यायांसम्। —निरुक्त, III. 13

4. III. 13-18; IX. 6.

5. See पाणिनि's अष्टाध्यायी II. 1. 55-56; II. 3. 72.

नटसूत्रs in the grammer of पाणिनि[1] which, whatever their character, must have had something to do with the actors. Further, tradition credits पाणिनि with the authorship of two महाकाव्यs known as पातालविजय and जाम्बवती विजय[2] though, it is still an open question whether the Gramarian and the Poet were one and the same[3]. From the वार्तिक of कात्यायन it is evident that such a division of काव्य as आख्यायिका had already come into existence[4]. पतञ्जलि, the author of the महाभाष्य *on Panini's Sutras, has fortunately left manyiclues by* which one can safely surmise that literary activities had been the characteristic of that age. He refers to one महाकाव्य[5] three आख्यायिकाs[6] and two नाटकs[7] by name, besides many *quotations and references of undoubted literary significance*[8].

These early grammatical works, as we have seen above do not fail to make us infer that the secular literature had begun to thrive somewhat luxuriantly even in the early *periods of our ancient history. We find additional support* to this hypothesis from the रामायण and the महाभारत which

1. पाराशर्यशिलालिभ्यां भिक्षुनटसूत्रयोः, IV. 3 110. ; कर्मन्दकृशाश्वादिनिः, IV. 3. 111.
2. Winternitz . Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, Vol. III. p. 32.
3. Dr. Peterson : JBRAS, XVII (1889), 57ff, J R.A.S 1891, 311. ff ; Pischel : ZDMG, 39. (1885) 95 ff ; R.G. Bhandarkar, JBRAS, XVI, 344
4. लुबाख्यायिकाभ्यो बहुलम् on the सूत्र, अधिकृत्य कृते ग्रन्थे ।
5. यत्तेन कृतं न च तेन प्रोक्तं वाररुचं काव्यम् । महाभाष्य Vol. II,p 315
6. They are वासवदत्ता, सुमनोत्तरा and भैमरथी. महाभाष्य Vol .II. p. 313.
7. ये तावदेते शोभनिका नामैते प्रत्यक्षं कंसं घातयन्ति, प्रत्यक्षं च बलिं बन्धयन्तीति । Vol II, p. 34 and 36.
8. Indian Historical Quarterly Vol II, pp. 464—470

contain a very large number of highly poetic passages Some of these are found quoted in the later authoritative works on Poetics[1]

The रामायण can be considered as a काव्य both from its form and its matter It is deservedly called an आदिकाव्य Various dates have been assigned to these two epics by different scholars Dr Jacobi places रामायण in the 6th century B C[2] The अर्थशास्त्र of कौटिल्य contains a number of references which clearly prove the existence of literary activities in his days[3]

It is not conceivable that with the writing of so much poetry, no speculation about the nature, function, division of poetry could have been going on side by side That we are not wrong in indulging in such an inference can be clearly made out by looking into the काव्यs and नाटकs of अश्वघोष[4] and by the inscriptions dating 2nd century on wards

---

1 See ध्वन्यालोक, pp 63 125 238 and काव्यप्रकाश, उल्लास IV

2 Dr Jacobi Das Ramayana

3 See Winternitz Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, Bd III p 369 See also अर्थशास्त्र (Jolly and Schmidt's Edn p 145 f

4 The contents of his works fully bear out the supposition that he was conversant with the dicta of अलङ्कारशास्त्र His काव्यs are divided into सर्गs which, as required, have different metres in the end His fragmentary dramatic work is called by himself a प्रकरण, just as his two extant काव्यs are styled as महाकाव्यs These few points along with many other minor ones, are quite significant in the case of a Buddhist preacher For details see Kane-Indian Antiquary 1912 p 127, also Winternitz—Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, Vol III pp 33, 34

The inscriptions of रुद्रदामन्[1] which may be considered beyond doubt the earliest of such literary inscriptions betray both from their form and contents their acquaintance with speculations on Poetics. Though no work has actually come down to us, we can find out from the नाट्यशास्त्र of भरत[2] and decidedly from काव्यालङ्कार of भामह[3] that a very large number of the writers on the subject had already contributed their quota for formulating regular theories of Poetics and Dramaturgy. It is not possible to determine with perfect satisfaction as to which of the two—Poetics and Dramaturgy—preceded the other. There seems to be, however, some probability that the Dramaturgy

---

1 See Epigraphica Indica Vol VIII 36. The inscription which is most useful for our purpose is found at Junagarh and dated 150 A C. It is not only written in a poetic style of a high merit but contains many words and phrases which clearly betray their unmistakable acquaintance with some extinct works on Poetics. The following few words may be taken by way of specimen सर्वक्षत्राविष्कृतवीरशब्दजातोत्सेकाविधेयानां यौधेयानां प्रसह्योत्सादकेन शब्दार्थगान्धर्वन्यायाद्यानां विद्यानां महतीनां पारणधारणविज्ञानप्रयोगावाप्तविपुलकीर्तिना स्फुटलघुमधुरचित्रकान्तशब्दसमयोदारालङ्कृतगद्यपद्य स्वयमधिगतमहाक्षत्रपनाम्ना नरेन्द्रकन्यास्वयंवरानेकमाल्यप्राप्तदाम्ना महाक्षत्रपेण रुद्रदाम्ना । In this connection the Gupta Inscriptions are also of great interest.

2 The present text, even though going by the name of भरत, scarcely seems to be the work of one man. Its contents betray frequent handling and rehandling and the incorporation of matters by persons of different dates. See P R Bhandarkar—Indian Antiquary Vol XLI, Kane—Indian Antiquary Vol. XLVI

3 Trivedi—Introduction to प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण and Indian Antiquary, Vol XLII

went somewhat ahead of Poetics The conception of a complete poetry was primarily essentially dramatic[1] and consequently Rhetoric proper fell within the folds of Dramaturgy[2] But with the growth of literature, काव्य could not always remain subservient to drama It claimed an independent consideration for itself, so that in course of time it began to include dramas within its own folds[3]

The history of Sanskrit Poetics can, therefore, be conveniently studied in these three stages, viz, (i) the first stage when the consideration of Rhetoric fell under Dramaturgy, (ii) the second stage when the two claimed independently separate considerations[4], (iii) the third stage when Dramaturgy came to be considered under Poetics The first stage was characterised by the simple and the crude speculations as is quite natural for a growing science at its outset The third stage covers the period of speculative elaboration and consequently of a relative perfection[5]

---

1 See नाट्यशास्त्र, XVI, 118 (काव्यमाला Edition) The theory is upheld by वामन in his काव्यालङ्कारसूत्र I 3 30 32 and अभिनवगुप्त in his अभिनवभारती (Chapter VI) where he says—काव्यं तावन्मुख्यतो दशरूपात्मकमेव । सर्गबन्धादौ हि नायिकाया अपि संस्कृतोक्तिरित्यादि बहुतरमनुचितम् ।

2 The काव्य may be taken to be, according to भरत, one of the four constituents of a drama It is called पाठ्यम् and is said to have been derived from ऋग्वेद । See नाट्यशास्त्र I 17 It is for this reason that दोषs, गुणs, अलङ्कारs etc claim only a partial treatment in the नाट्यशास्त्र । See नाट्यशास्त्र अध्याय XVI

3 अग्निपुराण, Chapter 337 and साहित्यदर्पण परिच्छेद VI

4 See भामह's काव्यालङ्कार I 24

5 Really speaking the conception of रस may be taken to be the determining factor of these various stages It was at first thought that complete रसानुभूति was possible from only a dramatic work by way of a combined effect of dialogues songs

It was in the second stage that the real formative work was undertaken and accomplished [1] This stage can be further considered under two sub stages, the first of which had much to do with speculations on what is called the शरीर and the second on the आत्मा of poetry It was आनन्द-वर्धनाचार्य, the well known poetician of Kashmir, who initiated and laid a firm foundation of the theory about the आत्मा of poetry, namely, ध्वनि ।

We have no data to determine the name and time of the author who, for the first time, undertook a scientific study of the शरीर of poetry We may, however claim

---

and acting The काव्य even after becoming a little more independently popular, could only be thought as generating the चमत्कार of शब्द and अर्थ and not of रस । This explains why we miss the treatment of रस in the works of भामह, दण्डी, वामन and others But with the advent of the ध्वनि School of आनन्दवर्धन a new conception of रस stepped in and decided the fate of the later development The रस was no more to be thought of as कार्य or ज्ञाप्य by means of a dramatic action but as व्यङ्ग्य, being suggested primarily by the words themselves See अभिनवभारती on नाट्यशास्त्र (Chapter VI)

1 The histrionic considerations had such an upperhand over other elements that the writers in the first stage could devote neither time nor attention to a detailed study of काव्य । Theatrical managements and stage arrangements along with the treatment of अभिनय and संगीत in all their elaborately worked out details, could neither allow them much space nor time for anything else It has been quite natural in the growth of every science and art that as soon as it becomes liberated from a subordinate position under its genre, it begins to claim attention from all sides and consequently to achieve wide ramifications Such has also been the case with our काव्य ।

from the evidence of the later writers of note that the great exponent of such rhetorical speculations was no other person than the great भामह himself There is no doubt that a number of writers on this subject[1] preceded भामह but perhaps the quality of their work as shown by the negligence shown to them by even the earlier writers of subsequent times, did not reach a very high water-mark And it is quite natural We cannot expect to find that scientific treatment in the infancy of a subject which becomes a necessary characteristic of it as it gradually develops So we should not be wrong if, from the reverence shown to भामह and negligence to his predecessors we were to infer that the first work on Poetics written on a strictly scientific plan was that of भामह। He seems to have judiciously assimilated the material available in the writings[2] of his predecessors and with the help of a creative genius which he undoubtedly possessed, arranged them on a sound basis with due elaboration and fitting limitation The employment of this method has been in his case, as shown by the result, an unqualified success The views which he held, the theories which he propounded mostly stood the test of time and criticism to such an extent that they were later on upheld by the greatest masters of the subject

---

1 भामह refers to रामशर्मा in काव्या०, II 19 58 to मेधावी in II 40 88, to शाखवर्धन II 47 We meet with a number of names which have been referred to as high authorities on Poetics in the काव्यमीमांसा of राजशेखर। Some of them are these—सुरानन्द, श्यामदेव, अपराजिति, द्रौहिणि and आनन्द। No work has come down to us under their names

2 भामह refers to अच्युतोत्तर of रामशर्मा in II 19 58, to राजमित्र of शाखवर्धन in II 45, III 10 and to an anonymous work called रत्नाहरण in III 8

It will not be, we think, out of place to take this opportunity and point out the salient features of भामह s work by referring to a few instances of such a nature

The definition of poetry (काव्य) has all along been a matter of great controversy with the writers on Sanskrit Poetics The easiest and the most convenient expression for denoting what broadly speaking काव्य represents has been given by भामह which is शब्दार्थौ काव्यम्[1] । It is given by मम्मट[2], the author of काव्यप्रकाश, with certain qualifications It is in fact in these qualifications[3] that the germs of divergence, which different schools of Poetics show in point of views they propound exist

The same observatition may be made with regard to the divison of गुणs The गुणs as given in भरत s नाट्यशास्त्र[4] as also in the काव्यादर्श of दण्डी[5] are ten in number वामन[6] doubles the number by assigning them both to शब्द and अर्थ । But all the later poeticians of note have had only three गुणs including all the others in them[7] But the first person who could point out that the three गुणs—माधुर्य ओजस् and प्रसाद —were all in all was भामह[8] । There has been no doubt,

---

1. काव्यालङ्कार I 16
2. काव्यप्रकाश Chapter I
3. See समुद्रबन्ध s commentary on अलङ्कारसर्वस्व p 4 (Trivendrum Edn) He writes thus विशिष्टौ शब्दार्थौ काव्यम् । तद् वैशिष्ट्य धर्ममुखेन, व्यापारमुखेन, व्यङ्ग्यमुखेनेति त्रय पक्षा etc
4. नाट्यशास्त्र p 211 (Benares Edn)
5. काव्यादर्श Chapter I
6. काव्यालङ्कारसूत्र
7. See काव्यप्रकाश Chapter VIII, साहित्यदर्पण Chapter VIII
8. काव्यालङ्कार II 1-3

some difference of opinion[1] regarding the meaning of these words but as far as the comprehensiveness of the division is concerned भामह s views has stood well

The next thing which we are to note in this connection is the consideration of वक्रोक्ति by भामह । वक्रोक्ति has played an important part in the history of Sanskrit Poetics If we were to take into consideration the various modes and forms which वक्रोक्ति has assumed in different times, it may be said to have a history of its own It was indeed कुन्तक who made much of वक्रोक्ति and founded a new school by writing his वक्रोक्तिजीवित [2] । But as for as our knowledge goes, भामह has been the first person to speak of वक्रोक्ति । वक्रोक्ति, as treated of by भामह [3], has not exactly the same signification as it had with कुन्तक but he was undoubtedly the fore runner of कुन्तक in recognising it at least as a vital element of poetic compositions[4]

The few instances cited above will be, it is believed, sufficient to convince any intelligent person of the high ability and genuine originality of भामह s expositions This conviction is brought home to us with greater insistence by his clear statements [5] that he duly exercised his critical intelligence before he wrote any thing Coupled with this high sense of real scholarship, he had, as is evident from his examples, Poetic powers of no mean order It is indeed

---

1 See काव्यप्रकाश, Chapter VIII

2 Two Chapters of this work have been ably edited by Dr S K De in Calcutta Oriental Series

3 काव्यालङ्कार, II 85

4 For detailed information about वक्रोक्ति, see the learned Introduction of Dr S K De to वक्रोक्तिजीवित ।

5 काव्यालङ्कार, III 58, VI 64

a rare combination that a person is gifted with profound scholarship, sound critical acumen, and with the abilities of a clear-headed logician, a clever grammarian and above all a master poet There is no wonder, therefore, that all the writers on Sanskrit Poetics—including even the humble writers of this humble paper—should bow down their heads with a heart full of deep reverence and grateful appreciation before such an august personality

II—SOME VARIANTS IN THE READINGS OF THE VAIŚEṢIKA SŪTRAS

By Gopinath Kaviraj

It is well known that the text of the philosophical sūtrās, as we find it to day, is not generally free from doubtful readings As regards the Nyaya sūtras in particular, this was noticed in very early times, and in the age of Vachaspati Miśra I (900 A D) they were already in such a state of confusion that he was compelled to revise them personally and give publicity to the result of his revision in the form of a manual, called 'Nyāyasuchinibandha' There is another work of a similar nature dealing with these sūtras, named 'Nyayasutroddhāra,' attributed to Vachaspati Miśra II (1600 A D). If all the commentaries and glosses on these Sutras, many of which are yet unpublished, are carefully studied a good deal of fresh light will fall upon many of the obscure questions involved and will eventually lead to a more correct determination of the sūtras

The Sūtras of the other systems of course do not seem to have been so much muddled, but even then it is doubtless that none of them represent, so far as the textual genuineness is concerned, absolute purity of the original form The study of these sūtras is likely to yield interesting results

Some years ago I came in possession, for a few days only, of an apparently very old manuscript (undated) of the Vaiśeṣika Sutras The MS was obtained by a friend of mine from a certain private collection at Benares * On a

* The owner of the collection being unwilling to have his name disclosed, no attempt was made by me to find it out

careful reading of these Sūtras I noticed several differences from the current text: (i) firstly, the readings were in several places different; (ii) secondly, some of the sūtras in the current editions were absent; (iii) thirdly, some sūtras not found in the current text were found there; and (iv) fourthly, in one case, what appears as a single sūtra in the current edition was read there as two distinct sūtras.

With these few preliminary remarks I proceed to note the differences, taking the Gujarati Edition (published in 1913) of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtras as standard for purposes of reference.

CHAPTER I.

Āhnika (i)

Sūtra 16—द्रव्याश्रयो गुणवान् संयोगविभाग-
योर्न कारणमनपेक्ष इति गुणलक्षणम् ।

„ 17—+ + संयोगविभागेषु कारणमनपेक्षमिति ।

„ 19—यथा गुणः ।

„ 20—संयोगविभागवेगानां कर्म ।

„ 21—न द्रव्याणाम् ।

„ 24—गुणवैधर्म्याच्च कर्मणाम् ।

„ 25— (a) द्वित्वप्रभृतयः संख्या ।
(b) पृथक्त्वसंयोगविभागाश्च ।

This sūtra (no. 25) is counted in the MS as two separate sūtras, viz (a) and (b), as shown above.

Sūtra 30— संयोगविभागवेगाश्च कर्मणाम् ।

The sūtra, no. 25, being split up as two sūtras, the total number of the sūtras in this section comes up to 32, rather than 31, as in the printed text.

Āhnika (ii)

Sūtra 1—कारणाभावाच्च, etc.

„ 5—+ + + कर्मत्वं च सामान्यं च विशेषश्च ।

„ 9—'च' is omitted.

After the last sūtra in the printed text, i. e. after the 17th sutra, there appears a unique sūtra in the MS, *viz.* न तु कार्याभावाद् गुणः ।

CHAPTER II.

Āhnika (i)

Sūtra 1.—रूपरसगन्धवती पृथिवी ।
„ 6.—+ + द्रवता + +
„ 7.—द्रवता
„ 9.—स्पर्शश्च ।
„ 10.—त्वयदृष्टस्पर्शलिङ्गो + +
„ 14 —वायोरायमूर्छनं नानात्वे लिङ्गम् ।
„ 15—वायुसन्निकर्षे प्रत्यक्षाभावात् ।
दृष्टं लिङ्गं न विद्यते
„ 30—Absent from the manuscript.

Āhnika (ii)

Sūtra 1—पुष्पवस्त्रयोः सति सन्निकर्षे गन्धाप्रादुर्भावो
वस्त्रे गन्धाभावलिङ्गम् ।
„ 19—+ अयथारूपत्वाच्च ।

CHAPTER III.

Āhnika (i)

Sūtra 7— अन्य एव + +

Āhnika (ii)

„ 3—+ + एकं मनः ।
„ 10—यद् दृष्टं प्रत्यक्षमहं देवदत्तः + +
„ 17—'न तु' is omited from the MS.
„ 21—शास्त्रसामान्याच्च ।

CHAPTER IV.

Āhnika (i)

Sūtra 11.—+ +चाक्षुषाणि प्रत्यक्षाणि ।
„ 13.—+ +सर्वेन्द्रियजं ज्ञानं + +

Before the 7th sūtra of this section, as arranged in the printed edition, there appears to have been another sūtra which has now disappeared. It is quoted by Uddyotakara in his Nyāyavārtika (Benares Edition, p. 231) as—"अद्रव्यद्रव्यत्वात् परमाणावनुपलब्धिः" । This sūtra is quoted by Puṇyarāja in his Commentary on the Vākyapadiya (Vol. II, p. 180), along with, and in succession of, what now appears as the 6th Sūtra of the current text. His reading however is—"द्रव्यत्वात् परमाणावनुपलब्धिः ।"

Āhnika (ii)

Sūtra 1.—तत् + + त्रिविधम् ।
शरीरेन्द्रियविषयसंज्ञम् ।
„ 4.—अणुसंयोगस्त्वप्रतिषिद्धो मिथः पञ्चानाम् ।
पार्थिवं तद्विशेषगुणोपलब्धेः ।

The reading मिथः पंचानां is known to Śankara Miśra, but it is absent from the current text. Perhaps the sūtra पार्थिवं etc. actually existed in the earlier Sūtrapāṭha, for it is referred to in the Upaskāra and appears in this MS. It seems to have been removed by the editors, as it is found to be identical with the Nyāya Sūtra 2.1.28.

CHAPTER V.

Āhnika (i)

Sūtra 9.—यत्नविशेषात् + +
„ 10.—+ +पतनविशेषः ।
„ 11.—+ +पाद्दुकर्म (?) व्याख्यातम् ।
„ 13.—प्रयत्नाभावे + +

Āhnika (ii)

Sūtra 16—तदना + + + मनसि ।
शरीरस्य सुखदु खाभाव सयोग ।
कायकारणात्मकर्म व्याख्यातम् (१) ।

This last one is an additional Sutra, altogether new, but the reading is evidently corrupt

Sūtra 25—गुणेन + + +

CHAPTER VI

Āhnika (i)

Sūtra 1— + + चेद्
5— + + आत्मान्तरेष्वकारणत्वात् ।
„ 12—एतेन समविशिष्ट + + +
„ 14—This does not appear in the MS

Āhnika (ii)

Sūtra 8—अयतस्य + + + विद्यते ।
नियमाभावाच्च ।
विद्यते वाऽर्थन्तरत्वमस्य ।

CHAPTER VII

Āhnika (i)

Sutra 2— + + + अनित्या ।
15— + + गुणैर्गुणा + + ।
17— + ह्रस्वत्वदीर्घत्वे + +
„ 21— 'च' *does not occur*

Āhnika (ii)

Sūtra 12—This Sutra is absent from the MS
„ *21*—एकदिक्कालाभ्या + +
„ *22*—कार्यापरत्वात् कारणापरत्वाच्च परत्वापरत्वे ।

Sūtra 23 —परत्वापरत्वाभावः etc (The first phrase परत्वापरत्वयोः is lacking in the Ms).

Sūtras 24—25.—These sūtras do not appear in the MS.

CHAPTER VIII.

Āhnika (i).

Sūtra 9.—समवायिनः श्वैत्यात् ।

श्वैत्यबुद्धेश्च श्वेते बुद्धिः ते एते कार्यकारणभूते ।

Āhnika (i).

„ 2 —दृष्टे + +

„ 5 —भूयस्त्वात् + + च ।

पृथिवी + + + प्रकृतिः ।

CHAPTER IX.

Āhnika (i).

Sūtra 7 — + + त्वात् ।

„ 12—The word प्रत्यक्षं is omitted.

Āhnika (ii).

„ 4 —'कारणं' is omitted.

„ 10 —'संस्कारदोषात्' omitted.

CHAPTER X

Āhnika (ii).

After the 8th and the 9th sūtras occurs: अस्मद्बुद्धिभ्यो लिङ्गमृषेः । This sūtra is also quoted by Śrīdhara in the Nyāyakandalī, p. 216.

III—HISTORY AND BIBLIOGRAPHY OF NYAYA VAIŚESIKA LITERATURE

BY GOPINATH KAVIRAJ

(Continued from Vol V, p 162)

The Deccani School

I—Chennu Bhatta

Chennu Bhatta, the author of a Commentary, perhaps the earliest yet extant, on Tarkabhāṣā (तर्कभाषाप्रकाशिका), is known to have been a native of Southern India From the colophon of this Commentary * it appears that he was the son of one Sahaja Sarvajña Viṣṇu that he had an elder brother named Sarvajña and that his patron was Mahārāja Harihara, assuredly identical with the famous king Harihara II of Vijayanagara (1400 A D)

This Sarvajña Viṣṇu was perhaps the same scholar whom the younger Mādhava (Sāyaṇa s son) mentions as the son of Śārṅgapāṇi and as his own guru in the beginning of his Sarvadarśana Saṃgraha (verse 2) and to whom Sāyaṇa refers as the author of Vivaraṇavivaraṇa in his Śaṅkara Darśana (तदुक्तं विवरणविवरणे सहजसर्वज्ञविष्णुभट्टोपाध्यायैः)† Whether Sarvajña Viṣṇu was the name which Vidyātīrtha, the chief guru (मुख्यं गुरु) of Vidyāraṇya and Sāyaṇa, bore

* इति श्रीहरिहरमहाराजपरिपालितेन सहजसर्वज्ञविष्णुपाध्यायानुजेन सर्वज्ञानुजेन चिन्नभट्टेन विरचितायां तर्कभाषाप्रकाशिकायां प्रमेयपरिच्छेदः समाप्तः । Aufrecht Oxf Catalogue, p 244a

† See Indian Antiquary 1916, p. 21

before his renunciation of the world is a question to which I am not in a position to offer any decisive reply with the data at present available to me*. But the fact that the invocatory verse—यस्य निःश्वसितं वेदाः &c—found in many of Sāyaṇa's and Vidyāraṇya's works occurs also in Chennu's Commentary, would appear to indicate that all these three scholars were disciples of one and the same spiritual preceptor, named Vidyātīrtha; and the fact of Sāyaṇa's quoting Sahaja Sarvajña Viṣṇu by name tends in my opinion against the possibility of identifying him with Vidyātīrtha.

Among the authors quoted in the Tarkabhāṣāprakāśikā (e. g. Udayana, Kandalīkāra, Maṇḍana Miśra, Vāchaspati Miśra, Varadarāja, Vādīndra and Śālikanātha) Varadaraja may be taken to be the author of Tārkikarakṣā and Vādīndra identical with the teacher of Bhaṭṭa Rāghava.

II.—Mahādeva Puntamkar.

The most prominent student of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika philosophy at Benares towards the end of the 17th Century was a Deccani Brāhmaṇa, by name Mahādeva, of the Puntāmkar family. He had been a pupil of Śrīkaṇṭha Dikshita and on his death succeeded him as one of the leading pandits of the city. But the chief little to his place in the history of the literature consists in his successful attempt at rescuing Bhavānanda's works from the unmerited obloquy into which they had fallen, by subjecting them to a critical analysis and bringing out their real worth.

---

* Reference may however be made in this connection to the illuminating paper on "Mādhavāchārya and his younger brothers" by Rao Bahadur R. Narasimhachar in the Indian Antiquary, 1916, pp. 17-24.

Mahadeva was the son of Mukunda*, himself a learned man, being the master of the six systems of recognised

---

* Here is a geneaological table of Mahadeva's family which I have secured through the good offices of Pandit Mukunda Śastri of Benares, a descendant of the author

Nilakantha Pant
- Balo Pant
  - Timaji or Tryambaka Pant
    - Ananta Pant — Author of
      (a) Vyangyartha Kaumudi, composed in 1646 A D
      (b) Commentary on Rasamanjari composed in 1653 A D for Chandrabhanu
      (c) Prose version of Mudrarakasa
      - Mukunda Pant, author of Satpadya muktival
        - **Mahadeva Pant**
          - Sambhu Pant
            - Ganeśa Pant
              - Soma Natha Pant
                - Mukunda Pant
                  - Gangadhara
                  - Mahadeva
                    - Ganeśa
                      - Viśvanātha
                        - Mukunda
                      - Sakharama
                        - Gangadhara, Govinda, Gopinatha, Damodara.
            - Govinda Pant — He acquired lands in 1730 Śaka or 1808 A.D

orthodox philosophy (षट्शास्त्रतत्त्वदर्शिनम्). He was a devotee of Śiva, and like his tutor Śrikaṇṭha, of the goddess Siddheśvarī*.

Mahādeva's time is known for certain. Among MSS himself for his own use—and the number of such MSS is a legion—I have found dates ranging from Saṃvat 1727 (= 1670 A. D.) to Saṃvat 1753 (=1696 A. D.). I place Mahādeva therefore in the second half of the 17th century.

From an entry in one of his MSS it appears that Mahādeva once went to Nadia on tour either in search of MSS or on invitation to attend some meeting of the pandits. He was in close touch with the scholars of Bengal whose learning he deeply appreciated.

His own works are :

A. Commentaries on

(a) Bhavānanda's

i. Dīdhitigūḍhārthaprakāśikā (=भवानन्दीप्रकाश)
This book was intended to defend Bhavānanda

---

* The goddess Siddheśvarī whose temple is in the city in the quarter known after her name is an old deity of Benares, of whom mention is found in the Kāśī Khaṇḍa. It has been regularly worshipped by the family of the Maunins for the last 7 or 8 generations. The image is now mutilated. Long ago it was proposed to replace it by a new image and so an image was made and arrangements were made to set it up with due ceremony for worship. But it is said that the goddess appeared in a vision and forbade such a procedure. The old image continued to be worshipped as usual. The new one is now to be found outside in a corner on the verandah. The following dhyāna will serve as a good description of the goddess :

लापयन्तीं महासिंहं ताडयन्तीं च माहिषम् ।
पद्मं खड्गं धारयन्तीं पालयन्तीं जगत्त्रयम् ॥

from the attacks of the Bengali pandits to which he had been exposed*.

ii. Didhitigudharthaprakasika (=सर्वोपकारिणी).†
Both these are commentaries on one and the same work, one a big and the other a short one Mahadeva himself states in the beginning of his Sarvopakarini that he wrote two distinct commentaries on the Bhavanandi, of which one, being overlaid with technical minutæ was intended for the critical students of philosophy, while the other was to serve for the beginner as a general introduction to the subject †

(b) Laugakṣi Bhaskara s

i. Padarthaprakaśa

B (a) न्यायकौस्तुभ It is an original treatise dealing with the main topics of Nyaya, containing as the author says an essence of the whole philosophy.

(b) Iśvaravada

(c) Navyanumitiparamarśayoh Karyakaranabhava vichara

(d) Sadṛśyavada

---

* अनालोच्य सिद्धान्तं वागीशत्वाभ्यां वृथा दूषितं पण्डितैर्गौडजातैः ।
पदुम्मानिन दूषणाभासकुन्दं तदुद्धाराय ममोद्यम एष ॥
(Beginning of Bhavanandi prakasa)

Towards the close of the Sarvopakarini Mahadeva calls the *Prakasa* and the *Kaustubha* his two sons, and the *Sarvopakarini* his daughter, begotten by his spiritual wife *Buddhi*. प्रकाशकौस्तुभौ पुत्रावात्मजा सर्वोपकारिणीम् । बुद्धिपत्न्यां जनयित्वा महादेवो व्यभावयत् ॥

† भवानन्दीप्रकाशस्तु विस्तृतो रचितो मया ।
अतः संक्षेपतः कुर्वे व्याख्यां सर्वोपकारिणीम् ॥

III *Nārayaṇa Tirtha*

Among Sannyāsins there must be a very few in number who would feel inclined to give their time and energies to the task of elucidating the dualistic doctrines of Nyaya Vaiśeṣika Any work, supposed to aim a blow at the Vedantic position, would be simply revolting in their eyes Far from encouraging such a work by writing commentaries upon it, they would not tolerate its existence But Bhikṣu Nārayana Tirtha was a notable exception to this rule Not only was he passively tolerant, with catholic indifference to all which did not concern him, but he wrote commentaries on three of the most popular and standard Nyāya works —

(a) Udayana s
  1 Kusumanjali Karikās

There is an incomplete MS of this commentary in the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares, where in the colophon at the end of Stavaka 3 the author is called परमहंस परिव्राजकाचार्य (Fol 186)

(b) Raghunatha's
  1 Tattavachintamanididhiti

(c) Viśvanatha s
  1 Bhāṣāparichchheda (न्यायचन्द्रिका)

Narāyana says in his Sankhya Chandrika * that he was

---

* See verse 1 at the beginning

श्रीरामगोविन्द सनार्थवाद् हनाविदेपादुपजातबोधम् ।
श्रीवासुदेवादधिगत्य सकलशास्त्राणि यच्छं किमपि स्पृहा मे ॥

Cf also his Vedāntavibhāvanā with (Sānkhya Chandrikā, Ben Sk Series, No 9, p 1) Commentary and Bhakti Chandrika (Mss belonging to Government Sanskrit Library, Benares)

the pupil of Vāsudeva Tīrtha and disciple of Rāmagovinda Tīrtha. And he seems to have been the teacher of the famous Brahmānanda Sarasvatī, usually called by the name of Gauḍa Brahmānanda (to distinguish him from another Brahmānanda who commented on the Paribhāṣendu Śekhara) author of a series of very learned Vedantic works, including Commentaries on Madhusūdana Sarasvatī's (a) Advaita Siddhi and (b) Siddhāntatattvabindu. This is apparent from Brahmānanda's own confession in the above commentaries *.

Nārāyana's age is not known for certain. The only thing that can be said is that he was later than the middle of the 17th Century, the time of Viśvanātha, on whose work he commented.

He must be earlier than 1701 A. D. (1758 Sam), the date of a MS of Muktāvaliprakāśa by Dinakara, belonging originally to his private collection and now deposited in the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares

---

* Thus in his

(a) Laghu Chandrikā, com on the Advaita Siddhi :

i. श्रीनारायणतीर्थानां गुरूणां चरणस्मृतिः ।
भूयान् मे साधिकेष्टानामनिष्टानाञ्च बाधिका ॥
Intro Verse 2 Advaita Mañjari Ed., p. 1.

ii. श्रीनारायणतीर्थानां पदाब्जोपास्तिसंयुषाम् ।
चरणौ शरणीकृत्य तीर्णः सारस्वतार्णवः ॥
Concluding Verse 2, Advaita Mañjari Ed., p. 643.

(b) Nyāyaratnāvali.—Com. on the Siddhāntabindu.

i. श्रीनारायणतीर्थानां गुरूणां चरणाम्बुजम् ।
नमामि वाङ्मनःकायैरनन्यशरणैः सदा ॥
Concluding Verse 1, Advaita Mañjari Ed p. 311.

IV.—Konḍa Bhaṭṭa

Konḍa Bhaṭṭa, son of Raṅgoji Bhaṭṭa and nephew of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, is better remembered for his works on Grammar, especially for his Vaiyākaraṇa Siddhāntabhūṣaṇa*, than for any treatises on philosophy, pure and simple. He was in a family of famous grammarians of Benares. His uncle Bhaṭṭoji Dīkshita†, the author of Siddhāntakaumudī, Śabdakaustubha, Manoramā, &c was a grammarian of the highest order, (besides being an authority in Smṛti and Vedānta) whose works in this branch of literature are still among the noblest in the field. His father Rangoji, however, does not seem to have been a grammarian at all. He was a Vedāntist, being the author of two interesting works on the subject, viz. Advaitachintāmaṇi and Advaitaśāstra-sāroddhāra‡.

To Nyāya Vaiśeṣika Literature Konda Bhaṭṭa seldom devoted his labours. We know however of three works

---

* It is said in extenuation of the many defects of this work that it was composed by the author at the early age of 22 and was not subsequently revised.

† It appears that Bhaṭṭoji became a dikṣita, probably the first dikṣita in the family, by initiating himself into the mysteries of the agnihotra ceremony and that his descendants (e.g. his son Bhanu dikṣita and grandson of Hari dikṣita) inherited the title as a matter of pure legacy. His brother Raṅgoji or his nephew Koṇḍa are not known by that title The name Raṅgoji Dikṣita, as used in Dr. Belvalkar's "Systems of Sanskrit Grammar" seems therefore to be a slip.

‡ Cf Aufrecht, Cat. Cat., I, p. 489 Both these works exist in the Library of Paṇḍit Mukunda Śāstrī. The former has been published in the Government Sanskrit Library Series, Benares. The second work is incomplete, being confined to one chapter only.

coming from his pen as contributive to this philosophy All these are of an elementary character and obviously intended for beginners

B (a) तर्कप्रदीप

A MS of this exists in the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares It was written at the instance of Raja Virabhadra*, and contains the following references चार्वाका $3b^{8}$ वेदान्तिन $4b^{12}$ मीमांसका $6b^{9}$ चिन्तामणिकार $8b^{7}$, आचार्या $9a^{4}$ लीलावतीकृत् $11b^{6}$ उदयनाचार्य $11b^{5}$, प्राच्या $11a^{5}$, $12a^{4}$ "अस्मत्पितृचरणा" 26a" अद्वैतचिन्तामणि (by his father) $26b^{7}$, 13 and वैयाकरणभूषण (his own work) $26a^{1}$,

(b) पदार्थदीपिका This is published in the Benares Sanskrit Series and requires no notice to be taken in this place

(c) तर्करत्न † This is referred to in (b)

F—*Krsna Bhatta Arde*

He was a resident of Benares, being the son of Raṅganātha and Kamalā‡ pupil of Hari and younger brother of Nārāyaṇa Bhatta He is known for the following works

* cf Hall p 79

† cf Hall p 78

‡ I examined a MS of Krsna Bhatta's Chitragaṅgādhara (fols 26 unknown to Aufrecht) in Gopāladāsa's private Collection In the 3rd introductory verse of this work the author speaks of his parents whom he names Raṅganātha (not Raghunātha as in Aufrecht Cat Cat I p 116) and Kamalā as already dead [illegible] मातर [illegible] [illegible] I [illegible] Cf also Ind Office Cat p 618 [illegible] (fol 1)

A Commentaries on

(a) Jagadīśa's

i Commentary on Chintāmaṇidīdhiti (=जगदीशतोषिणी or मञ्जूषा).

and (b) Gadādhara's

i. Commentary on Chintamaṇidīdhiti (=काशिका)

and ii. Śaktivāda

VI— Madhava Deva

Mādhava Deva was the son of Lakṣmana Deva and grandson of Mādhava Deva of Dhārā-ūrapura* on the bank of the Godāvarī He was himself a man of Benares where he had been living for a long time past From the introductory verses of the Tarkabhāṣāsāramañjarī it appears that he read with his own father Lakṣmaṇa His works, only two in number within our present knowledge, were written at Benares and held in high esteem among the local Pandits (" काशी पण्डित मण्डलीषु विलसन् ")

His works are

A Commentary on

(a) Keśava Miśra's

i Tarkabhāṣa (तर्कभाषासारमञ्जरी or तर्कप्रकाश), where the following are referred to, गौरीकान्त fols 7a[5], 13b[8], 15a[7], 18[7], 20a[3], 23a[2], 24a[7] 34b[6], 38a[6], 43b[4], 44b[7]s 46b[13], 46b[6] 49a[7], गोवर्द्धनप्रभृतयः—fol 45a[8], गोवर्द्धन fols 34b[6], 38b[5], 43b[3],

* Not Dhārā, or modern Dhar, as supposed by Mr A V Kathavate in his Report (1891 95) p 15 Dhārā is a town in Central India, whereas Dhārāsurapura is farther South, in the Deccan, on the bank of the Godāvarī.

45a[12], गोवर्द्धनबलभद्रौ fol 16a[6], प्राचीनाः – fols 11b[1], 30b[508], 45b[8], मणिकृत् 48b[10]; दीधिति 45a[4], 46a[1], पण्डितम्मन्य 50b[5]* and रुद्रभट्टाचार्य ।

Of the earlier commentators Gaurikanta has been most severely treated

(b) Raghunātha s

1 Tattvachintāmanidīdhiti, A part of this work, dealing with the import of the particle एव was known to Hultzsch, No 1418, II, p 133

(b) Rāmachandra's

1 Commentary on Gunakiranavali, known as Gunarahasya (" गुणरहस्यप्रकाश ") as in Hall, p 67 or गुणसारमञ्जरी as in Mitra, 1453)

B

(a) न्यायसार This is the earlier work of Mādhava (mentioned in Tarkabhasasāramañjarī on fols 29[4], 44a[11], 50a[10]) and merits appreciation It was written at Tripurarirajanagara, or Benares From the fact that Mādhava names Rudra Bhattacharya and Bhattoji Diksita he could not have lived earlier than the middle of the 17th century, and the existence of a copy of Nyayasara in the India Office Library, transcribed in Sam 1767 (1710 A D) furnishes the posterior limit of his age In all probability therefore he belonged to the latter part of the 17th century

* The folios refer to the MS, not yet numbered, which has just been acquired for the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares

VII — Dharmaraja Adhvarindra

As the author of Vedantaparibhasa Dharmaraja's reputation stands high among modern students of philosophy, his Nyaya works have been forgotten and are now generally unknown But it was for these works that he seems to have been remembered in his life time

He was an inhabitant of the village of Kandaramanikya and was the *son of one Trivedinarayana Yajvan of the* Kaundinya family * He is known to have been the pupil of Pandit Venkatanatha of Velangudi, a village which Mr Burnell † locates in the Kumbhakonam Taluk of the Tanjore District Dharmaraja mentions his Paramaguru's name to be Nrsimha Yati who may be tentatively identified with the author of Bhedadhikkara (1547 A D) Rama krsna, Dharmaraja's son, refers to Nrsimha in his Sikhamani The time of Dharmaraja falls therefore somewhere about the middle of the 17th Century

In the introductory verses of the Vedantaparibhasa Dharmaraja speaks of his two Nyaya treatises, both commentaries, named below

A —(a) On Sasadhara's

1 Nyayasiddhanta dipa‡ (न्यायरत्न) a copy of this

---

* Burnell Tanjore Catalogue p 115 b

† Ibid p 90 a But Mahamahopadhyaya Krsnanatha Nyayapanchanana in his commentary on the Vedantaparibhasa (pp 3 4) speaks of Velangudi to be a village on the bank of the Narmada I leave the point open for discussion by men more competent to deal with questions of South Indian biography

‡ टीका शशधरस्यापि बालव्युत्पत्तिदायिनी । This along with the line following (पद्याजनया पञ्चपादिका व्याकृता मया), does not occur in the current texts The latter commentary is called पद्दीपिका (see Hultzsch, No 1152)

work exists in the Tanjore collection (vide Burnell, p 119 b)

and (b) On Gangesa's

1 Tattvachintamani (तर्कचूडामणि), where he claims to have overthrown the views of ten previous commentaries This seems however to be an idle vaunt*

VIII—Ramakrsna Adhvarin

Dharmaraja's son Rāmakrsna was the author of a Commentary, known as न्याय शिखामणि, on Ruchidatta's Tattvachintamaniprakaśa† This is the only work on Nyaya from Rāmakrsna's pen From his commentary (वेदान्त शिखामणि) on his father's Vedantaparibhasa it appears that Rāmakrsna was highly proficient in the New Logic of Eastern India and that his training was more on the line of a controversian than on pure Upanishadic lore‡

* There is a commentary of this name on the Tattvachintamaniprakasa, Cf "A triennial Catalogue of Mss by Rangacharya Kuppu Svami Śastri, Vol I p, 793 (R No 578)

† Burnell, p 115 b

‡ He also wrote a commentary on Sadananda's Vedanta sāra

IV.—AN ATTEMPT TO ARRIVE AT THE CORRECT MEANING OF SOME OBSCURE VEDIC WORDS

By Sitaram Joshi

---

1. दोषावस्तर् (दोषाऽवस्तः)

R V I. 1.7.

This word is found in the Rgveda only thrice, once here
and again in each of the stanzas at R. V IV 4 9[2], and
VII 15 15[3]. It bears the same vocative accent in all the
three places, and, obviously, is used in the same sense It is
a compound formed from the root 'vas' to dwell or to
wear, as Indian scholars take it (वस् निवासे आच्छादने च) or
from 'vas' to shine as the western scholars would have it
(see Macdonell's Vedic Grammar for Students and Monier
William's Lexicon), by adding to it the verbal (कृत्)
termination तृच् or तृ, denoting an agent, and having for its
prefix (उपपद) the word दोषा So the form 'दोषावस्त,'
is a vocative having the Udātta accent on its first syllable.
Its meaning according to Indian scholars would be 'one
who dwells at night, or one who wears or covers the night',
(रात्रेः निवसनशील रात्रेराच्छादयितर्वा) Sāyana and the
Western scholars* would take it as 'one shining in the
darkness'

Sāyana† takes it as a copulative compound (द्वन्द्वसमास)
of two words 'doṣā' and 'vastar He says that the word
'doṣā' stands for night (दोषाशब्दो रात्रिवाची) and 'vastar'

---

* See S. B E Series, Vol. XLVI, p. 4.

† Sāyaṇa's Commentary on Ṛgveda I 1 7

for a day (चह्न इत्यहर्याची) Sayana seems to regard this compound word similar in *form* to the two words 'doṣā' and 'vastoḥ' (दोषावस्तो *), which are frequently used in the Ṛgveda, not as a compound as the Pada text will show but separately though simultaneously, 'doṣā' standing for night and 'vastoḥ' for day

For the accent of the word 'दोषावस्तर्' Sayana maintains it by applying to it Pāṇini s Sutra " कार्तकौजपादयश्च This Sutra says that the 'Kārtakaujapādi' is a collection of words (गण) beginning with the compound word 'Kartakaujapa (कार्तकौजप), and whenever they are used as a copulative compound (द्वन्द्वसमास) their first word assumes its natural accent (एषां द्वन्द्व पूर्वपद प्रकृत्या)† As Sayana takes this word 'दोषावस्तर्' as a copulative compound, its first word 'doṣa must have its natural accent on the second syllable, which is not to be found here Here the accent is on the first, which fact clearly indicates that the form, दोषावस्तर् is a vocative ‡ This is one of the many slips in Sayana s commentary on the Rigveda

In Rg V VII 15 15 we find his interpretation of the word as रात्रेराच्छादयितर्' The reason for this is quite clear In VII 15 15 we come across the word दिवानक्तम् after 'दोषावस्तर् How could he possibly translate both the words to mean the same thing? To avoid this tautology, he was obliged to take 'vas meaning आच्छादन' The question arises—how could Sayana not make out his own mistake in the two previous passages? He must have held the firm

---

* Vide R V I 104 1, 179 1 V 32 11 VI 5 2, 39 3, VII 1 6, VIII 25 21, X 40 4

† See S K 3771 Sutra

‡ Pāṇini VI 1 198 आमन्त्रितस्य च

opinion that there is hardly any difference between 'वस्तोः' and 'वस्तर' or he must have mistaken one word for the other But it is not likely that he would identify वस्तः and वस्ते In the passages occurring in the first and fourth Mandalas, though there are words like दिवे दिवे and अभिद्यून, they will not lead to absurdity if 'दोषावस्तर्' be translated or interpreted as 'night and day They would mean 'every day in the morning and in the evening' as some of the Westerm scholars have tried to point out in order to defend Sayana I admit this situation but I hold that if the Vedic poets really intended that meaning for 'दोषावस्तर्', they would not have in any case used it, as we see it in VII 15 15 with its synonym दिवानक्तम्, thus giving rise to mere tautology This single instance is quite sufficient to point out that the Vedic poets never intended that meaning for the word

Moreover there are other reasons to show that 'दोषा वस्तर्' will never mean 'day and night or vice versa

Firstly, Sayana s statement that 'vastar stands for 'a day *lacks support* We never come across such an *independent* word as 'वस्तर्' standing for 'a day in the whole of the Rgveda Secondly, instead of 'वस्तर्' we always meet with 'वस्तोः' which means 'a day and which is used side by side with दोषा, and sometimes independently also The Nighantu tells us that the word for 'a day is 'वस्तोः' and not 'वस्तर् Thirdly, we do not even find the two words दोषा and वस्तोः used in a compound though they stand side by side because the Padapātha separates them We once meet with the sing of वस्तर् i e वस्ता in R V III 49 4, which is used with the genetive plural क्षपां as क्षपां वस्तर, clearly indicating that the termination added to वस् is a verbal one (तृच) and is subjective (कर्तरि) and according to Panini II 2 15,

the compound of the two words is impossible In case of ' दोषावस्तर् ' the word ' दोषा ' being indeclinable, Panini's rule is not violated Besides, the Vedic words are not bound by Panini's rules as the famous saying lays down—छन्दसि दृष्टानुविधि So the instance of दोषा वस्ता goes to confirm our statement that ' वस्तर् ' is formed from the root ' vas by the addition of तृ

The two words ' दोषा ' and ' वस्तोः ' are always used separately as we have pointed out above, often with, and sometimes without, the intervention of any word or words Each of them is used independently also without being accompanied by the other Once the word ' दोषा ' is found in plural as दोषाः in R V I 179 1, there is found also the repetition (वीप्सा) of the word ' वस्तो ' as a compound of ' वस्तोः ' and वस्तोः in R V X 60 103 but no such use is found of 'वस्तर्

We may call here other commentators for the support of our statement This very stanza of Rgveda I 1 7, occurs in Vajasaneyi Samhita III 22 where Uvata and Mahidhara, the well known Commentators of that text, interpret the word दोषावस्तर् as हे 'दोषावस्तर् दोषेति रात्रिनाम । वस निवासे) रात्रौ वसनशीलो दोषावस्ता तस्य सम्बोधन हे दोषावस्तर्, i e the word दोषावस्तर् is a vocative 'doṣa is a synonym of night and the root ' vas ' is to dwell one who is habituated to dwell at night is doṣāvastar ' and the same addressed, is दोषावस्तर् Uvata, for the support of his statement calls in sacerdotal quotation as "अग्नौ ह वै देवा ' इत्युपक्रम्य नो सगूल रात्रि 'प्रविशत' इति यद्ननेनेति द्यग्नेनोच्यते तदय मन्त्रा दृष्टाह दोषावस्तरिति This legend shows that there is no necessity of conjecturing the meaning of 'shining for the root ' vas ' where we can do very well with the usual

meaning of 'dwelling' Mahidhara also says the same thing by adding to it "दोषा रात्रिस्तस्यामपि वसति अजस्रं धार्यमाणत्वान्नोपशाम्यतीति दोषावस्तः"

Oldenberg has very well pointed out that the authors of Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra and Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sutra* use this word clearly as a vocative Aśvalayana, while addressing Agni, uses this epithet and instructs how to address him in the morning and in the evening He says यदि सायं दोषावस्तर्नमः स्वाहेति । यदि प्रातः प्रातर्वस्तर्नमः स्वाहेति ' A. S S III 12 4, Oldenberg, in his comment on this word in S B E XLVI, p 4, admits that he takes the word as a vocative, but does not feel sure of his position Let us quote the note here fully 'I have translated 'doṣāvastar' as a vocative, which, as is rendered very probable by the accent, was also the opinion of the diaskeuests of the Samhita text The author of the sacrificial formula which is given in Āśval Śrau III 12 4 and Śankh Gṛh V 5 4 evidently understood the word in the same way, there Agni is invoked as 'Doṣavastar and as 'Pratarvastar' as shining in the darkness of evening and as shining in the morning That this may indeed be the true meaning of the word is shown by Rgveda III 49 4 where Indra is called 'Kṣapām Vastā' the illuminator of nights (Kṣapām is gen plur, not sing as Bartholomae Bezzanbergeis Beitrage XV, 203 takes it) *The very frequent passages, however, in which case forms of doṣā stand in opposition to words meaning 'dawn' or 'morning'—which words in most cases are derived from the root 'vas', strongly favour the opinion of Gaedicke* (Der Accusativ in Veda. 177, note 3) and K. F. Johansson (Bezzenbergens Beitrage XIV 163) *who give to doṣāvastar the meaning 'in the darkness and in the morning*

---

* A S S III 12 4, 2 S G S V 5 4

13

This translation very well suits all Rgveda passages in which the word occurs If this opinion is accepted, dosavastar very probably ought to be written and accented as two independent words, dosā vastar See M Müller, Physical Religion, p 173 etc

We have already shown the absurdity of his statement in the underlined passages as the accent would not allow us to do so, moreover in R V VII 15 15 there is clear repetition and the word 'vastar is never used independently for 'a day'

Griffith translates this word 'dosāvastar as a dispeller of night He does not seem to prefer this meaning of 'shining' or his own meaning 'dispeller of night' in the rest of the two passages There he renders them by 'eve and morning' So in VII 15 15 he is obliged to translate the word 'दिवानक्तम्' by 'day and night' The word 'dosā' may mean 'the eve but the word 'वस्तोः' does not and 'वस्तर्' never means 'the morning' Moreover the accent is to be ignored Even then there is hardly any *difference in meaning between 'morn and eve' and 'day and night',* to use both of which will mean pure tautology

Pānini's Dhātupātha does not give the meaning 'to shine' for 'vas It gives only two meanings 'वस' आच्छादने and 'वस' निवासे, Macdonell in his Vedic Grammar for Students enlists this root meaning 'to shine, the forms of which are very similar to those of 'उच्छी निवासे' As the Indian Scholars were never aware of this meaning they have always taken 'vas' as meaning *'to wear or 'to dwell as we have shown above*

V—A COMPARISON OF THE CONTENTS OF THE RGVEDA-, VAJASANEYI-, TAITTIRIYA-, AND ATHARVAVEDA-(CĀTURADHYĀYIKA) PRATISĀKHYAS.

By Mangal Deva Shastri.

Continued from p. 114 of Vol. V.)

7 *Faults in pronunciation*·

	Rg. Prāt	Vāj Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt	Ath. Prāt
General nature of faults in pronunciation	XIV 1		...	..
Faults in the pronunciation of sounds in general*	XIV 2—9	Cp 1.26	Cp XVII. 8	..
Faults in the pronunciation of vowels in general†	XIV 10, 11, 54, 56		...	...

* निरस्त, व्यास, पीडन, अस्पृष्ट, शून, सदष्ट, विद्दिष्ट, ग्रस्त, अनुनासिक ।

† अयथामात्रवचन, संदंश, व्यास, पीडन, निरास, अन्यवर्णता, राग ।

	Rg Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Suppression or addition of a short vowel .	XIV. 40	...	...	...
Separation of a conjunct consonant by a vowel, or *anaptyxis* (see also conjunct consonants) .	XIV 19	...	....	...
Fault in the pronunciation of *a*, *ā* ...	XIV. 12	....	...	...
Fault in the pronunciation of *i* .	XIV. 45	...	...	...
„ „ „ of *r*, *r*	„ 18	...	....	...
„ „ „ of *i*, *ḷ* ...	„ 46	....	...	...
Aiy pronounced as *Ayy* or vice versa ...	„ 11, 12	...	...	...

Ai pronounced as *ayi* or vice versa ...	,, 43, 44	...	...	...
Faults in the pronunciation of : consonants in general* ...	XIV. 15—17, 55	...	...	...
initial sonant consonants	,, 18	....	...	....
initial aspirates ..	,, 19	....	...	....
the first four *vargas* ..	XIV. 21	....	...	...
the first *varga*	,, 22	.	...	...
the second and third *vargas* ...	,, 21	.	...	...
the fourth *varga* ...	,, 23, 25	...	....	...
voiceless dentals	,, 39	...	...	...
a semi-vowel .. .	,, 50	...	...	...

* अदेसे वचन, अन्योन्येन विराग, लेशेन वचन, पीडन, परक्रम ।

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
a group of sounds containing a semivowel	„ 14	...	...	...
r	„ 24, 26	....	...	...
l	„ 27	...	....	...
Suppression of *y* or *v* ...	„ 48 (Cp. also 42, 43)	...	....	...
Addition of *y*	XVI. 47 (Cp. also 41, 44)	....	...	...
nsertion of a breathing ...	XVI. 52	...	...	...
nults in the pronunciation of initial breathings ...	„ 19	...	...	...
voiceless* breathings ...	„ 20, 29	...	...	....

* Cp. Uvaṭa.

ḥ	,, 28, 35, 36, 57	...	...	...
Visarjanīya	,, 30—33, 36 (Cp. Müller)	...	But cp. II. 48	...
Faults in the pronunciation of nasalized sounds ...	XIV. 13	...	....	...
yamas	,, 34—36, 53	Cp. IV. 162	....	...
Anusvāra instead of nasalizing a vowel	,, 37	But cp. III. 133	But cp. XV. 2, 3	...
Addition of Anusvāra ...	,, 51	...	...	...
Lengthening of a short nasal vowel	,, 51	...	...	..
Faults in the pronunciation of conjunct consonants .	XIV. 49, 58 (Cp. also 14 16, 44 36, 42, 48,52,53,55,57)	Cp. IV. 162, 163	...	But cp. II. 38, 39

... RITIYA VID...

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Hiatuses	XIV 59-62	...	..	..
Defects in the utterance of accents (see also under *accent*) .	III. 29-33	....	...	...
Utility of the treatise in view of the impossibility of enumerating all the faults ...	XIV. 63, 64	...	...	...

8. General:

		Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
14	Certain objections against the teaching of phonetics and their refutation ...	XIV. 68, 69	...	...	...

III. SANDHI OR EUPHONIC COMBINATION.

Introductory :

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Relation of Pada and Samhitā texts ...	II. 1, 2, Intro stanza 3	I. 155–158	V. 1, 2	Cp. II. 1
Four kinds of combinations or Samhitās ...	...	...	XXIV. 1, 4	...
Nature of hiatus, its duration and varieties ...	II. 3, 4, 13, 14, 79, 80	..	...	...
Different views on the nature of the following *a* vowel in certain hiatuses ...	II. 81, 82	...	XI. 19 (Cp. G. Gopāla)	....
In case of coalescence of a nasalized vowel with another vowel the result is also nasal. ...	Cp. XIII. 26	IV. 51	X. 11 (Cp. Whitney)	I. 69

In case of nasalization of *r*-vowels, the part following the *r* receives the nasal quality ...	..	...	...	I. 71
The sound preceding an aspirate becomes a non-aspirate ...	Cp. VI. 2, XII. 9	IV. 108	XIV. 5	I. 94

1. Final vowels :

	Ṛg. Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt.	Taitt. Prāt.	Ath. Prāt.
Combination of simple final vowels with similar initials ...	II. 15	IV. 50,51	X. 2	III. 42
Exceptions. ...	II. 57-59,61, 65,66,72,74	IV. 85	X. 13	...
Irregular combination of final *a* with initial *a* into *a* ...	II. 71,72	...	...	III. 43
Combination of final *a*, *ā* with initial vowels (*i*,*ī*,*u*,*ū*,*e*,*ai*,*o*, *au*...	II. 16,19	IV. 52,53,56	X. 3,7	III. 44-45, 50,51
Exceptions ...	II. 59,63,71 73,74	IV. 85	X. 13	...
Irregular combination of final *a*, *ā* with initial *i* into *ai*, with initial *ū* into *au*, with initial *o* into *o*, or with initial *e* into *e*	II. 71,73	IV. 54,55,57	Cp. X. 14	III. 52

Combination of final *a*, *a* with initial *r* ...	II. 32	IV. 48	Cp. X. 8,9	Cp. III. 46-49
Exceptions ...	II. 64	...	...	...
Conversion of a final non-guttural simple vowel into a semivowel before a dissimilar vowel. ...	II. 21-23	IV. 45	Cp. X. 15	III. 39
Exceptions ...	II 56, 59, 70-74	IV. 85	IX. 16, 17, X. 18	...
Combination of final diphthongs	II. 25, 28, 31	IV. 46	IX. 11-15, X. 19-23, 25	II. 21-24, III. 40
Exceptions ..	II. 70, 73, 74	...	...	...
Combination of final *e* and *o* with initial *a* (see also *initial vowels*) ...	II. 33	...	IX. 13	....
Exception	II. 73	...	...	...
Final vowels not liable to combination ...				

	Ṛg Prāt.	Vāj. Prāt	Taitt Prāt	Ath. Prāt.
Pragṛhya vowels	II. 51-54, 56 74	IV 86, 88	X 24	III. 33
Exceptions	II 70, 72	IV 87		...
Prolated vowels ...	Cp. I. 4	IV 90	X 24	Cp I. 97
Special cases of uncombinable finals ...	II 32, 57-59, 74	IV 85, 89, 91	X 13, 18	III 34, 36

(To be continued)

VI.—AN INDEX TO THE RAMAYAṆA.

(Continued from Vol VI.)

BY MANMATHA NATH RAY.

GAVAYA—The Vānara chief who partook in the corona- tion ceremony of Sugrīva (IV. 26 35) Lakṣmaṇa passed by his richly furnished house in Kiṣkindhā (IV. 33.9). काञ्चनशैलाभ. महावीर्यः Supplied Sugrīva with 5 krors of Vānaras (IV. 39. 23). Sugrīva wanted to send him to the South in search of Sītā (IV. 41 3). Having ran-sacked the Vindhyās, entered the Ṛkṣa cave along with Hanumān in search of water (IV 50. 1—8). Appointed leader of the expeditionary force by Rāma (VI. 4. 15). तेजस्वी बलदर्पितः (VI 26 44). Fought at the south gate under Aṅgada (VI. 41. 39—40) Ran about here and there defending the army (VI 42 31). Attacked Rāvaṇa with huge stones but disabled (VI. 59. 42—43). Wounded by Indrajit (VI. 73 59) On the occasion of Rāma's coronation fetched water from the Western seas (VI. 128 55). Created by the gods to help Rāma (VII 36 48)

GAVĀKṢA—The Vānara Chief who partook in the coronation ceremony of Sugrīva (IV. 26 35). Lakṣmana passed by his richly furnished house in Kiṣkindhā (IV 33. 9). Lord of the Go-lāṅgulas भीमपराक्रमः In response to Sugrīva's call supplied 1000 krores of Vānaras (IV. 39. 19). Sugrīva wanted to send him to the South in search of Sītā (IV. 41. 3). Having ran sacked the Vindhyas, entered the Ṛkṣa cave in search of water (IV 50 1—8). In reply to Aṅgada's appeal told that he could jump 20 Yojanas (IV. 65. 3). Appointed leader of the expeditionary force to the south by Rāma (VI. 4. 15). The lord of the सितमुखाः महाबलाः गोलांगुलाः (VI. 27. 32—33). Fought

at the south gate under Angada (VI. 41. 39—40). महाकायः भीमदर्शनः गोलाङ्गूलः महावीर्यः Stood beside Rāma with his soldiers (VI. 42. 28). Ran about here and there defending the army (VI. 42. 31). Wounded by Indrajit (VI. 46. 20). Carefully guarded the Vānara army (VI. 47. 2—4). Attacked Rāvana with a huge stone but disabled (VI. 59. 42—43). Guarded the gates carefully at the desire of Rāma (VI. 61. 37). Attacked Kumbhakarna but was wounded (VI. 67. 24—28). Wounded by Indrajit (VI. 73. 59). Wounded by Mahāpārśva (VI. 98 11). Created by the gods to help Rāma (VII. 36 48). Greeted and honored by Rāma (VII. 39. 21).

GĀDHI—Born after the celebration of the Putreṣṭi Sacrifice (I.34 5) परमधार्मिकः Father of Viśvāmitra (I.34.6) and Satyavatī (I. 34. 7). Son of Kuśanābha (I. 51. 19). Admitted the supremacy of Rāvana (VII. 19. 5).

GĀNDHĀRA—The Land of the Gandharvas. Conquered by Bharata on behalf of his sons (VII. 101. 11).

GĀYATRĪ—Her temple at Agastya's hermitage visited by Rāma (III. 12 20). Accompanied Rāma on the occasion of his Great Renunciation (VII. 109. 8).

GĀRGYA—A great Ṛṣi of the east who came to greet Rāma on his return home (VII. 1. 2). Preceptor of Rājā Yudhājit of Kekaya: son of Angirasa ब्रह्मर्षिः अमितप्रभः Came to Ayodhyā with rich presents to deliver a message from Rāma's uncle and was respectfully received by Rāma (VII. 100 1—5). In compliance with the request of Rāma (VII. 100. 6—8) delivered the message of Yudhājit, viz. he should annex the country watered by the Sindhu which was then being ruled by the Gandharvas (VII. 100. 8—13). Led the van of Bharata's army (VII. 100. 20).

GĀLAVA—A great Ṛṣi of the east who came to greet Rāma on his return home (VII 1 2) Established peace between Rāvana and Māndhāta by acting as the mediator (VII 23 (c) 55—56)

GRĀMANI—A Gandharva Chief who dwelt in the sandal forests of the Ṛṣabha Hills सूर्यसमप्रभ रविसामाग्निपु (IV 41 42—43) विश्वावसुसमप्रभः Married his daughter Devavati to Sukeśa धर्मात्मा (VII 5 1—3)

GIRIVRAJA (i)—पुरवर A town founded by Vasu, the son of Kuśa, also called Vasumati after the name of the founder Surrounded by the five hills through which flows the Śona, also known as the Sumagadhi (I 32 8 9)

GIRIVRAJA (ii)—Vasiṣṭha's messengers arrived at that town [Probably the chief town of Kekaya] (II 68 21 22)

GUHA—The lord of the Niṣadas whom Rāma met at Śṛṅgaverapura during his exile He accompanied the Princes as far as Citrakūṭa (I 1 30) His meeting with Rāma foreseen by Valmiki (I 3 14)

बलवान्, रामस्यात्मसम सखा, also known as स्थपति (II 50 33) Went to receive Rama on foot with his relatives and officers (II 50 34) Embraced Rāma with suitable words and offered food etc (II 50 36 39) Asked his men to offer fodder and water to Rama's horses (II 50 47) Talked away the whole night with Laksmana and Sumantra (II 50 50) Asked Laksmana to go to sleep and offered to watch Rama with his men (II 51 2 7) Shed tears when Laksmana recounted his own and his brother's sorrows (II 51 27) Laksmana having communicated Rama's desire to cross the Ganga asked his men to get ready a boat (II 52 4 6) When the boat arrived he informed Rama about it and asked him to board it without delay (II. 52 7-9)

Requested by Rāma fetched some milk of the banyan tree (II 52 68 Asked his men to mind their business when Rāma etc had taken their seats on the boat (II 52 77) Talked with Sumantra for a long time after Rāma had crossed the Gangā (II 57 1) Dismissed Sumantra (II 57 3) Ruled over Śṛṅgaverapura etc वीर (II 83 20) Seeing the huge army of Bharata suspected his intentions towards Rama so commanded his men to guard carefully the ford and advised his men to allow a safe passage to Bharata only if his intentions were good (II 84 1 9) Approached Bharata with presents (II 84 10) Being admitted into the presence of Bharata offered to entertain his army for the night (II 84 15 18) Offered to accompany him to Rama s place but questioned his intentions with regard to Rama (II 85 6 7) Praised Bharata for the nobility of his heart (II 85 11 13 Consoled Bharata when he was overtaken with grief (II 85 22) Admired Lakṣmana s devotion to Rama and in support of his point related the fact that Lakṣmana though requested by him did not go to sleep for Rāma was lying on a bed of straws and then related how they had departed for the forests under his very eyes (II 86 1 25) Pained to find Bharata lying unconscious (II 87 4) In reply to Bharata s enquiries showed him the bed where Rama lay and narrated the services of Lakṣmana (II 87 14 24) Next morning saw Bharata and enquired if he had slept well (II 89 4 5) Directed by Bharata asked his kinsmen to collect boats in which the army might cross the river (II 89 8 9) Himself brought out a Svastika boat (II 89 12) Engaged by Bharata to locate the dwelling place of Rama (II 98 4) Followed Bharata on foot to see Rama (II 98 18) Embraced by Rama and Lakṣmana (II 99 41) निषादाधिपति (VI 125 4) स रामस्य आत्मसम सखा

(VI 125 5) At the desire of Rama, Hanuman informed him of the safe arrival of his intimate friend (VI 125 22 24)

GUHYAKAS, The—A class of demi Gods attending on Kuvera Played with Kuvera on the banks of the tank on the Kailasa hills (IV 43 23) Went into raptures when Rama killed Kumbhakarna (VI 67 172) Came to witness the duel between Ati Kaya and Laksmana (VI 71 65) Accompanied Brahman to propitiate Vayu (VII 35 64)

GOKARNA—Where Bhagiratha retired to practise austerities (I 42 12) Kesari left the Malyavan for—(V 35 80) Rāvana and his brothers practised austerities there (VII 9 47)

GODĀVARI, The—Flowed by the Pañca Vati (III 13 18) रम्या पद्मिनी पद्मशोभिता (III 15 11) पुष्पितैस्तरुभिर्वृता (III 15 12) हंसकारण्डवाकीर्णा चक्रवाकोपशोभिता, मृगयूथनिपीडिता (III 15 13) Rama etc in exile set up their abode Bethed there da ly in the proximity of—(III 15 11 13) (III 16 2) शीघ्रस्रोता The rapidity of her flow slowed down on the appearance of Ravana (III 46 7 8) हंससारससंघुष्टा (III 49 31) सरितां वरिष्ठा (III 63 13) ताश्चैव नौ (III 64 3) After the abduction of S ta Rama inquired if she knew the whereabouts of S t but for fear of Ravana held her peace (III 64 6 11) रम्या Sugriva asked Angada to go there in search of Sita (IV 41 9 Rama s car passed across—(VI 123 45 49)

GOPA—A Lord of the Gandharvas who entertained Bharata with music at the hermitage of Bharadvāja (II 91 46)

GO PRATĀRA—A holy spot in the Sarayu whoever of Rama s followers and companions gave up his life there, proceeded to heaven (VII 110 22 24)

GOMATĪ The—crossed by the exiled Rāma, situated to the south of the Kosala territory शीतवहा नदी, गोयुता, सागरङ्गमा (II 49 10 11) Crossed by Bharata on his return journey from Kekaya at Vinata (II 71 16) Saurocana, the Vānara chief dwelt there formerly (VI 26 25) Hanumān crossed it (VI 125 26) On their way to the hermitage Sitā and Lakṣmana spent a night on its bank (VII 46 19)

GO MUKHA—Son of Mātali, and charioteer to Jayanta Indrajit overwhelmed him with arrows (VII 28 10)

GOLABHA—A Gandharva chief who carried on a 15 years' war without intermission with Valin, till he died in the sixteenth year महात्मा महाबाहु दुर्विनीत (IV 22 27-29)

GAUTAMA (i)—a sacrificial priest to Daśaratha (I 7 5) राजकर्ता (II 67 2) Attended the court on the morning following Daśaratha's demise and advised Vasiṣṭha to appoint a king without delay (II 67 6 8) Helped Vasiṣṭha in conducting the coronation ceremony of Rāma (VI 128 60) Summoned by Rama entered his presence chamber and was duly received (VII 74 4 5) Witnessed the oath taking ceremony of Sitā in Rama's court (VII 96 5)

GAUTAMA (ii)—Practised austerities with his wife Ahalya in the outskirts of Mithilā महात्मा (I 48 14 16) Ahalyā raped by Indra (I 48 17 22) महामुनि While leaving the cottage Indra came upon him (I 48 23) देवदानवदुर्धर्ष तपोबलसमन्वित तीर्थोदकपरिक्लिन्न दीप्यमानमिवानल: (I 48 24) समित्कुशपाणि Angry at finding Indra in disguise pronounced a curse on him (I 48 26 27) Condemned his wife to pine for a thousand years till relieved by Rāma, when he promised to take her back (I 48 29 32) Retired to the Himālayas to practise austerities महातेजा:

महातपाः (I. 48 33) Indra rendered मेषवृषणः through his influence (I 49 10) Honored Rāma and restored Ahalyā to favor (I 49 21) Came from the north to greet Rama on his return home (VII 1 5) At first Ahalyā was deposited as a trust with him by Brahman and when his patience had been sufficiently tested, she was given in marriage Indra having raped Ahalyā, he cursed him and his wife and then predicted about her emancipation (VII 30 30 45) Lived near Vaijayantapura—the capital of Nimi (VII 55 5 6). In the absence of Vasiṣṭha acted for him at Nimi's sacrifice (VII 55 11)

GHANA—A Rākṣasa chief whose palace was visited by Hanumān (V 6 23)

GHṚTĀCI—The divine courtesan who as the wife of Kuśanābha gave birth to a hundred daughters (I 32 11) Her help prayed for by Bharadvāja in the matter of entertaining the retinue of Bharata (II 91 17) Viśvāmitra's fancy for her for ten years referred to by Tārā (IV 35 7)

GHORA—A Rakṣasa chief whose house was burnt down by Hanuman (V 54 13)

CAKRA—A Rakṣasa chief whose palace was visited by Hanumān (V 6 24)

CAKRAVAN, The—A hill situated in the fourth part of the Western Sea There rests a big wheel of a hundred spokes manufactured by Viśvakarman There Viṣṇu captured the conch shell and the wheel after killing the Dānavas, Pañcajana and Hayagrīva Sugrīva asked Suṣeṇa and others to ransack its caves and valleys in search of Sitā (IV. 42 27—29)

CAṆḌA—A Vānara chief who joined the expeditionary force against Rāvaṇa अदीन. (VI 26 27—28)

CANḌĀLA, The—Bluish in appearance, rude, wearing blue cloths, with dishevelled hair, wearing garlands offered at the funeral pyre, besmeared in ashes and wearing ornaments made of iron (I 58 10—11)

CANḌODARI-क्रूरदर्शना The Rākṣasī guard of Sītā who threatened to devour her if she did not yield to the embraces of Rāvana (V 24 38—41)

CANDANA FORESTS, The—The Vānara population thereof joined the expeditionary force of Rāma under Satrocana (VI 26 22)

CANDRA, The—Hills in the Kṣiroda sea, on which grew medicinal herbs (VI 50 31)

CANDRA—Born of the Kṣiroda Sea शीतरश्मिः निशाकरः (VII 23 22 Stands 80,000 leagues above the Milky Way (आकाशगंगा) When assailed by Rāvana, burnt him with his 'burning cold' rays—सर्वसत्वसुखावह: (VII 23 (d) 15—18) शीतांशु: दहनात्मक स्वभाव: (VII 23 (d) 20) लोकस्य हितकाम: द्विजराज: महाद्युति: (VII 23 (d) 23) Won the high position by celebrating the Rjāasuya Sacrifice सोम: धर्मवित् (VII 83 7).

CANDRAKANTA—A town, सुरुचिर: निरामय (VII 102 5) In the Malla Bhūmi विख्याता दिव्या स्वर्गपुरी यथा (VII. 102 9)

CANDRA KETU—Son of Lakṣmana, धर्मविशारद: दृढविक्रम (VII 102 2) मल्ल Made king of the Malla Bhumi (VII. 102 9)

CANDRA-CITRĀ—A country in the West Sugriva sent Suṣeṇa etc. there in search of Sita (IV 42 6).

CĀRAṆAS The—In accordance with the desire of Brahman, produced Vānara children who would render assistance to Rāma वनचारिणः (I 17 9 23) Ruled over by Indra (I 45 15) Lived on the heights of the Himālayas (I 48 33) Requested by Indra to get his testicles restored (I 49 1 4) Dwelt in the hermitage of Vasiṣṭha (I 51 23) Appeased the wrath of Śiva and Viṣṇu (I 75 18 19) Witnessed the duel between Rāma and Paraśu Rāma (I 76 10) Prayed for the success of Rāma when he fought with Khara (III 23 27 2?) Came to see the fight (III 24 19) Praised Rāma profusely and indicated their joy on the destruction of Khara (III 30 29 33) Rāvaṇa passed through groves frequented by them (III 35 15) They talked over the abduction of Sītā amongst themselves (III 54 10) Lived on the banks of the Śoṇa (IV 40 23) Haunted the Sudarśana Lake for the sake of pleasure (IV 40 41) Haunted the Mahendra Hill (IV 41 22) Haunted the Puṣpitaka Hills (IV 41 28) Denizens of the aerial regions (V 1 1) Saw Hanumān disappearing for a moment in the jaws of Siṁhikā (V 1 184) Were surprised to find Laṅkā being reduced to ashes by Hanumān and were still more surprised when they found that Sītā had escaped unscathed (V 55 29 32) Paid compliments to Rāma when his army crossed the sea (VI 22 84 85) Prayed for the welfare of the universe while Indrajit fought with Lakṣmaṇa (VI 89 38) Became deeply concerned when Rāvaṇa overpowered Rāma (VI 102 30) Went into rapture on the death of Rāvaṇa (VI 108 30) Denizens of the third atmospheric region (VII 23 (d) 5) Greeted Arjuna on the defeat of Rāvaṇa (VII 32 65)

CITRAKŪṬA The—Being advised by Bharadvāja, Rāma with his brother and wife set up his abode there (I 1 31) During his stay there Daśaratha died of grief

(I. 1. 32-33). Bharata went to him and pressed him hard to return home. But Rāma refused (I. 1. 33-37). For fear of being disturbed by the citizens, Rāma moved on thence to the Dandaka forests (I. 1. 40). Rāma's visit foreseen by Vālmiki (I. 3. 15). Ten Krośas from Prayāga. गिरिः महर्षिसेवितः पुण्यः पर्वतः शुभदर्शनः गोलाङ्गूलानुचरितः वानरर्क्षनिषेवितः गन्धमादनसन्निभः (II. 54. 28-29). So long as a man looks at its peaks, he thinks of doing noble deeds and his mind is not overtaken by folly (II. 54. 30). Wherefrom numerous Rṣis with shrivelled-up heads have proceeded to the heaven after practising austerities for a hundred years (II. 54. 31). मधुमूलफलोपेतः (II. 54 38). नानानगगणोपेतः किन्नरोरगसेवितः (II. 54. 39). मयूरनादाभिरुतः गजराजनिषेवितः (II. 54. 40) पुण्यः रमणीयः बहुमूलफलायुतः Infested with elephants and the deer (II. 54. 41-42). Crowded with streams, water-falls, caves, fissures and rivulets; resounding with the cooing of the Kokilas and the lapwings, and haunted by parties of elephants and herds of deer (II. 54. 42-43). Its scenic beauty described (II. 56. 6 11; 13 15). Rāma etc reached there (II 56. 12). The pleasant sight of which effaced the memory of separation from Ayodhyā (II. 56. 35). Three yojanas and a half from Bharadvāja's hermitage रम्यनिर्दरकाननः (II. 92. 10). Described by Bharata (II. 93. 7-19). Bharata reached there (II. 99 14). Before taking his departure Bharata walked round it (II. 113. 3). The Rṣis who lived there were oppressed by the Rakṣasas (III 6 17). प्राज्यमूलफलोदकः सिद्धाश्रितः देशः मन्दाकिन्यविदूरतः नानापुष्पसुगन्धी (V. 38. 13-14). Rāma's car passed across— (VI. 123. 49 50).

CITRA-RATHA—an old counsellor and charioteer of Rāma. On the eve of his exile, Rāma instructed Lakṣmana to make valuable presents to him (II. 32. 17-18).

CŪLIN—महाद्युतिः ऊर्ध्वरेताः शुभाचारः "Practised the Brāhma austerities (I. 33. 11). Tended by the Gandharvî Somadā (I. 33. 12). Pleased with her devotion asked her the way in which he might recompense her (I. 33. 13-14). मुनिः वाक्यकोविदः (I. 33. 15). In fulfilment of her desire (I 33. 15-17) granted her a mind-born son, Brahmadatta by name. ब्रह्मर्षिः (I. 33. 18.).

CAITRA-RATHA (i)—A forest crossed by Bharata on his way back from Kekaya (II. 71. 4).

CAITRA-RATHA (ii)—The gardens of Kuvera in the land of the Uttara Kurus (II 91. 19). The garlands which could be seen only there appeared in Prayāga by the might of Bharadvāja (II. 91. 48). Destroyed by Rāvana (III. 32. 15-16). Where reigns the Spring season throughout the year (III. 73. 8).

COLĀ—A country in the South. Sugrîva asked Angada to go there in search of Sîta (IV. 41. 12).

CYAVANA—A great Rsi who practised austerities on the Himalaya. A scion of the family of Bhrgu (I. 70. 31-32) In reply to the queen Kālindi's prayer (I. 70 29-33) predicted that she would give birth to a son "with poison" (स+गर) (I. 70. 34-35). देववर्चस् (I 70 32). विप्रः (I 70. 34). Led a deputation of Ṛṣis to Rāma (VII 60 4). In reply to Śatrughna's query (VII. 67 1-2), described how Lavana destroyed Māndhātā of the Ikṣvāku line, then advised him to kill him at a time when he would come out leaving his arms behind (VII. 67. 3-26) A descendant of Bhrgu, consulted by Budha with regard to Ila (VII 90. 5). Witnessed the oath-taking ceremony of Sītā in Rāma's Court (VII. 96. 4).

CHĀYĀ-GRĀHA—A Rākṣasî Hanumān's visit to her fore-seen by Vālmiki (I 3 28).

JATĀPURA—A रम्य town in the West. Sugrīva sent Suṣena etc. there in search of Sītā (IV. 42. 13).

JATĀYU—A vulture of the Pañcavaṭī forest killed by Rāvaṇa (I. 1. 53). The carcase burnt by Rāma (I. 1. 54). His death foreseen by Vālmīki (I. 3. 21) On his way to Pañcavaṭī Rāvaṇa met him. महाकायः भीमपराक्रमः (III. 14. 1). In reply to Rāma's enquiries (III. 14. 2) introduced himself as his father's friend (III. 14. 3). As such honoured by Rāma who further asked him to trace his descent and his name (III 14. 4). Did so accordingly and incidentally narrated the history of the creation (III. 14. 5-32). Son of Aruṇa and Syenī and brother of Sampāti (III. 14. 33). Offered to look after Sītā during the absence of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa (III. 14. 34). Embraced by Rāma closely (III. 14. 35). Appointed protector of Sītā, as such accompanied Rāma into the Pañca-vaṭī (III. 14. 36). Seen by Sītā while she was being abducted by Rāvaṇa and charged to give that piece of information to Rāma and Lakṣmana (III. 49.36-40). Roused from sleep by the cries of Sītā, saw her being abducted by Rāvana (III. 50.1). पर्वतशृंगाभः तीक्ष्णतुण्डः खगोत्तमः वनस्पतिगतः (III. 50.2). Advised Rāvana not to molest the innocent Rāma and then challenged him to fight a duel (III. 50 3-28). पुराणे धर्मे स्थितः सत्यसंश्रयः (III. 50.3). गृध्रराजः महाबलः (III. 50.4). Born 60,000 years ago, since then he had been ruling over his ancestral dominions (III. 50.20). Fought a hard-contested battle with Rāvana in the aerial regions in the course of which scratched his body mercilessly, broke two bows and his chariot; killed the horses and the charioteer, and unseated Rāvana from his car. Praised by all creatures for his bravery. Wounded Rāvaṇa with his bills and talons, lopped off his set of left arms. At last his wings and talons were cut off by Rāvana and he dropped down mortally wounded (III. 51.1-43)

महातेजाः (III. 51.13). बली (III. 51.15). श्रीमान् पक्षीराजः (III. 51.18). वीर्यवान् (III. 51.33). नखपक्षमुखायुधः (III. 51.35). अरिन्दमः (III. 51.38). अतूलवीर्यः (III. 51. 41). नीलजीमूतनिकाशकल्पः सपाण्डुरोरस्कः उदारवीर्यः (III. 51. 45). His loss mourned by Sītā (III. 51 46) Finding Rāma rushing at him with his bow and arrow drawn ready for use, informed him of the abduction of Sītā by Rāvaṇa, the story of his resistance and the mortal wounds inflicted by the enemy (III. 67.13-20). Embraced by Rāma (III 67 21). In reply to Rāma's anxious enquiries (III. 68 1 7) told that Rāvaṇa had taken her towards the south by the aerial route, foretold that Rāma would recover Sītā in no time by destroying the might of Rāvana So saying died vomitting blood mixed with flesh (III. 68 8 17) His death mourned by Rāma and Lakṣmana who duly performed his last rites (III. 68. 18-38). His whole hearted devotion to the cause of Rāma highly praised by Angada in the presence of Sampāti (IV 56 9-14). धर्मज्ञः (IV. 56 12) गुणज्ञः श्लाघनीयः विक्रमैः (IV. 56 21). His death at the hands of Rāvana described by Aṅgada (IV. 57 9-11). Accompanied by his brother, Sampāti, vanquished Indra, but was overcome by Sūrya (IV. 58. 4-6). कामरूपिन् (IV 60 19) Dropped down senseless in Janasthāna (IV 61. 16) Remembered gratefully by Sītā (V. 26. 16 17).

JATI—A great Nāga chief vanquished by Rāvaṇa (VI. 7. 9).

JANAKA I—Son of Mithi and founder of the royal line of the Janakas. His son was Udāvasu (I. 71 4)

JANAKA II—Raja of Mithilā शूरः सत्यवादी महाभागः (I 13 21). His future relation with Daśaratha predicted by Vasiṣṭha. Sumantra deputed to fetch him to Ayodhyā to witness the performance of the Aśvamedha (I. 13. 22)

परमधर्मिष्ठः Celebrated a sacrifice which was attended by Viśvāmitra, Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa (I. 31. 6). In possession of a wonderful jewel of bows (I. 31. 7). महात्मा (I. 31. 11). Ruled over Mithilā (I. 48. 10). Received Viśvāmitra etc. warmly, accompanied by due forms (I. 50. 6-8). Offered them seats and then asked the Ṛṣi to wait till the Devas appeared to claim their due shares (I. 50. 12-16). Enquired about Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa (I. 50. 17-21). Viśvāmitra after relating their adventures told him that they had come to examine the Great Bow (I. 50. 22-25). Having eulogised Viśvāmitra took leave of him to attend the sacrificial session (I. 65. 31-39) वैदेहः मिथिलाधिपः (I. 65. 39). Next morning received Viśvāmitra and the Princes in audience. धर्मात्मा (I. 66. 1-3). महात्मा (I. 66. 4). On being requested by Viśvāmitra to show the bow to the Princes (I. 66. 4-6) related the history of the bow and concluded by promising to marry Sītā to Rāma if he could bend the bow (I. 66. 7-26). At the request of Viśvāmitra, asked his men to bring the bow—garlanded and besmeared in scents (I. 67. 1-2). When the bow was brought in (I. 67. 3-5) in glowing terms described its potency, how it had baffled the attempts of the Devas and the Asuras, what to speak of men ; then asked Viśvāmitra to show it to the Princes (I. 67. 7-11). The noise produced by the cracking bow did not overpower him (I. 67. 19). वाक्यज्ञः Congratulated Rāma on his success and requested permission to send his men to Ayodhyā to bring Daśaratha over to Mithilā (I. 67. 20-26). With the consent of Viśvāmitra, did so (I. 67. 27). Learning that Daśaratha had reached Videha, made arrangements for receiving him formally. श्रीमान् (I. 69. 7). Received him warmly and proposed to celebrate the marriage next morning (I. 69. 8-13). Performed the rites and ceremonies connected with marriage at night. महातेजाः (I. 69. 18). Next morning

sent for his brother Kuśadhvaja from Sāṅkāśya (I. 70. 1-4). On his arrival the two brothers seated themselves on the thrones and sent for Daśaratha and the Princes (I. 70. 9-12). धर्मवत्सलः (I. 70. 9). अमितद्युतिः (I. 70. 10). वीरः (I. 70. 11). On hearing out Vasiṣṭha who recited the genealogical table of the Ikṣvākus (I. 70. 14-45) traced his own descent from Nimi and described how he annexed Sāṅkāśya and gave it away to his brother (I. 71. 1-19). Promised to give Sītā in marriage to Rāma and his second daughter, Ūrmilā, to Lakṣmaṇa (I. 71. 20-22). Requested Daśaratha to perform the rites and ceremonies preceding the marriage ceremony which was to take place on the third day (I. 71. 23-24). At the request of Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra consented to give the two daughters of Kuśadhvaja in marriage to Bharata and Śatrughna (I. 72. 11-12). Honored the two Ṛṣis (I. 72. 15). असंख्येयगुणः (I. 72. 18). Vasiṣṭha having sought for permission to introduce the groom's party, gladly gave it and said that he too was ready with the girls (I.73.10-16.) महातेजाः परमधर्मवित् (I 73. 13). Requested Vasiṣṭha to conduct the ceremony (I. 73. 18-19). When the fire was lit up and the offerings were made by Vasiṣṭha, he placed Sītā in front of the fire facing Rāma, then he formally requested Rāma to accept his daughter Sītā as his life-long companion. So saying he sprinkled the holy water on them (I. 73. 24-28). Asked Lakṣmaṇa to put his hands in those of Ūrmilā (I. 73. 30-31), Bharata in those of Māṇḍavī (I. 73. 31-32); Śatrughna in those of Śrutakīrti (I. 73. 32-33). Gave suitable presents to his daughters while they were leaving for Ayodhyā (I. 74. 3-7). Not invited by Daśaratha while the latter intended to appoint Rāma as the Crown-Prince (II. 1. 48). Presented with a few weapons on the occasion of a sacrifice by Varuṇa, which he passed on to Rāma at the time of latter's marriage (II. 31. 29-30).

Remembered by Kausalyā on the death of Daśaratha (II. 66. 7; 11). वृद्धः अल्पपुत्रः (II. 66. 11). Sītā introduced herself as the daughter of— ; महात्मा (III. 47. 3). Rāma guessed the grief of Janaka when he would learn the fate of his daughter (III. 62. 12-14). Remembered by Rāma while mourning the loss of Sītā (IV. 1. 106). The jewel given him by Indra, was transferred to Sītā at time of her marriage (V. 66. 4-5). Dismissed by Rāma with due honour (VII. 38. 2-7).

JANAMEJAYA—The blind old father prayed that his son who had been killed by Daśaratha might go to the abode where Janamejaya dwelt (II. 64. 42).

JANASTHĀNA—Śūrpanakhā was an inhabitant of that place (I. 1. 46). Had a colony of 14000 Rākṣasas who were killed by Rāma (I. 1. 47—48). For fear of the Rākṣasas the ascetic-colony moved from—(II. 116. 11—25). Inhabited by Khara and other Rākṣasas (III 18. 25). The news of the massacre of the Rākṣasas communicated to Rāvaṇa by Akampana (III. 31. 1—2). The same fact communicated to Mārīca by Rāvaṇa (III. 31 40). Having Killed Mārīca Rāma hastened towards—(III. 44. 27). Charged by Sītā to carry the news of her abduction to Rāma (III. 49. 30). राक्षसैः बहुभिः कीर्णम्, नानाद्रुमलतायुतम् (III. 67. 5—6). Rāma's aerial car passed across—(VI. 123. 42—45). Modern name of the Daṇḍaka (VII. 81. 20).

JAMADAGNI—Son of Ṛcika and father of Paraśu-Rāma. Received the great Vaiṣṇava Bow from his father. Killed by Rājā Kārtavīrya Arjuna when he had laid aside his weapons. महात्मा अप्रतिकर्मा तपोबलसमन्वितः (I 75 22—24). Came from the north to greet Rāma on his return home (VII. 1. 6).

JAMBU-MĀLI—A Rākṣasa chief whose palace was visited by Hanumān (V. 6. 21.) At the desire of Rāvaṇa (V. 42. 44) fought a duel with Hanumān and was killed

(V 44 1—18) Son of Prahasta बली महादंष्ट्र धनुर्धर (V 44 1) रक्तमाल्याम्बरधर स्रग्वी रुचिरकुण्डल महान् विवृत्तनयन· चण्ड. समरदुर्जय (V 44 2) महातेजा (V 44 6) महाबल (V 44 13) महारथ (V 44 18) Hanuman set fire to his house (V 54 11) Fought a duel with Hanuman (VI 43 7) Wounded Hanuman on the breast (VI 43 21)

JAMBŪDVĪPA—Surrounded by hills, dug open by Sagara s sons (I 39 22) Lies to the north of Saumanas Mt (IV 40 59)

JAMBŪ PRASTHA—A village where Bharata on his way back from Kekaya broke his journey (II 71 11)

JAMBHA—A Vanara chief who hurried on the invading army to the South during its march to Lanka (VI 4 36)

JAYANTA (i)—A counsellor of Daśaratha (I 7 3) Went out to receive Rama on his return (VI 127 11)

JAYANTA (ii)—A messenger sent by Vasiṣtha on the death of Daśaratha to bring back Bharata to Ayodhya (II 68 5) Reached Raja gṛha (II 70 1) Well received by the Raja and the prince, approached Bharata delivered Vasiṣtha s message and handed over the presents to him (II 70 2 5) Replied to Bharata s enquiries and requested him to make haste (II 70 11 12)

JAYANTA (iii)—Son of Indra and Śaci अपराजित । Fought a duel with Megha nada at the head of the divine army At last abducted by his maternal grandfather, Poloma (VII 28 6 20)

JAYĀ—A daughter of Daksa Gave birth to hundreds of weapons (I 21 15) Having been granted a boon she produced fifty invisible weapons as sons for the destruction of the Asuras (I 21 16)

JALODA SEA The—One found oneself there after crossing the Kṣiroda ocean सर्वभूतभयापह । In the waters

of which Brahman placed the ocean fire arising out of the wrath of Aurva Rsi Where one hears the continuous sound of lamentation raised by the water animals for fear of being burnt to death (IV 40 47 49) Sweet watered (IV 40 50) Sugriva asked Vinata to go there in search of Sita (IV 40 16)

JAVA—Father of Viradha the Rākṣasa (III 3 5)

JAHNU—A Rṣi whose sacrificial area was overflooded by Gaṅga Being angry he drank off the water Appeased by the Devas etc who conceded that Gaṅga was his daughter Released her by way of the ears (I 43 25 38)

JĀTA RŪPA ŚILA, The—Hills situated to the north of the Jaloda Seas 13 Yojanas in length सुमहान् कनकप्रभ । There dwelt the moon white snake which supported the Earth Sugriva asked Vinata to go there in quest of Sitā (IV 40 50 51)

JABALI—A sacrificing priest of Daśaratha (I 7 5) Came to Ayodhya when sent for by the king for performing the Asvamedha (I 8 6) On the way to Mithila the coveyance carrying him preceded that of Dasaratha (I 69 5 6) On the morning following the death of Daśaratha attended the court and advised Vasiṣṭha to appoint a king without delay (II 67 5 8) ब्राह्मणोत्तम (II 108 1) In support of Bharata tried to persuade Rama to return to Ayodhya by preaching his Epicurian vie vs In short he wanted Rama to believe that he owed no duties to his father who was dead and gone and that in pursuit of visionary ideals he ought not to resign things which were sure to come (II 108 2 18)

[Jabali did not believe in the efficacy of Sraddhas Sacrifices ascet cism gifts and worshipping the gods (II 108 14 16)] Seeing that Rama had taken his argument in an

unfavourable light, excused himself by saying that he was
not an atheist, but did reason in that way simply to persuade
him to return to Ayodhyā (II 109. 37 39). Returned to
Ayodhyā with Bharata दृढव्रतः (II. 113. 2). Helped
Vasiṣṭha in conducting the coronation ceremony of Rāma
(VI 128 60). Summoned by Rāma entered his presence-
chamber and was duly received (VII. 74. 4-5). Consulted
by Rāma on the eve of his Aśvamedha sacrifice (VII 91. 2)
Witnessed the oath taking ceremony of Sitā at Rāma's court
(VII. 96 2).

JĀMBAVĀN—A bear created by Brahmā from his
yawn (I. 17. 7). Partook in the coronation ceremony of
Sugrīva (IV. 26. 35) Lakṣmaṇa passed by his richly
decorated house at Kiṣkindhā (IV. 33 11). ऋक्षराजः
महातेजा. Supplied 10 Krores of soldiers to Sugrīva (IV. 39.
26-27) Sugrīva wanted to send him to the south in search
of Sitā. महौजाः (IV. 41. 2). Having ran-sacked the Vindhyas
entered the Rkṣa cave in search of water (IV. 50. 1-8).
The words of Sampāti put him in high glee and anxiously
enquired if any body had seen Sitā being abducted by Rāvana
(IV. 59. 1 4). The oldest of all the Vānara chiefs. In reply
to Aṅgada's appeal told that even at that advanced age he
could easily jump across 90 yojanas (IV 65 10 17) In
reply to Aṅgada's offer (IV 65 18 19) persuaded him that he
should give his servants the first chance (IV 65 20-27).
वाक्यकोविदः (IV. 65 20) महाप्राज्ञः (IV 65 28) In reply
to Aṅgada's protest (IV. 65 28 32) suggested the name of
Hanumān who alone could carry out the task (IV 65 33-
35) Describing the early life of Hanumān and his marvel-
lous adventures, appealed to him to gird up his loins for
jumping across the sea—since he had become old and cripple
(IV. 66 1-37) Went round the earth 21 times at the time
of Vāmana Avatāra and threw heaps of medicines into the sea

by churning which, the Amṛta was produced (IV. 66. 32-33). Finding Hanumān ready to take a leap across the sea extended a hearty send-off and promised to do penance standing on one leg till he returned safely (IV. 67. 30-35). On hearing the loud roars of Hanumān on his return journey (V. 57. 14-18) told the Vānaras about his success (V. 57. 22-23). हरिश्रेष्ठः (V. 57. 22). Asked Hanumān to describe to them in detail everything that happened since he left them (V. 58. 3—6). अर्थवित् (V. 60. 14). In reply to Aṅgada's proposal (V. 60. 1-13) said that they should carry out the orders of Rāma and Sugrīva to the very letter, so proposed that they should return without delay with this piece of news (V. 60. 14-20). Placed in charge of the flank of the invading army by Rāma (VI. 4. 20). Did as directed (VI. 4. 34). शास्त्रबुद्ध्या विचक्षणः (VI. 17. 45). In reply to Rāma's request (VI. 17. 31-33) thought they had reasons to suspect the motives of Bibhīṣana (VI. 17. 45—46). Placed in charge of the flank of the army (VI 24. 17). Younger brother of Jāmbavān, mightier than his brother (VI. 27. 10.) प्रशान्तः गुरुवर्ती संप्रहारेषु अमर्षणः (VI. 27. 11). Helped Indra during his wars with the Asuras (VI. 27. 12). Son of Gadgada (VI. 30. 20). Was to lead the attack against the central fortress along with Bibhīṣana (VI. 37. 32). Fought near the central stronghold with his army (VI. 41. 44 45). Wounded by Indrajit (VI. 46. 19). Carefully guarded the Vānara army (VI. 47.2-4). At the desire of Sugrīva (VI. 50. 8—10) re-assembled the disorganised Vānara army (VI. 50. 11). Killed Mahānāda (VI. 58 22). Wounded by Indrajit (VI. 73. 45). स्वभाव जरया युक्तः, वृद्धः, Covered with arrows, appeared like extinguishing fire (VI. 74. 14) In reply to Bibhīṣaṇa's query (VI. 74. 15) haltingly said that he could recognise him by his voice as he had lost his eyes; further enquired if Hanumān till then lived (VI. 74.

16 18) In reply to Bibhiṣana's query (VI 74 19 20) said that he cared much for the life of Hanumān because every wrong would be set right if he lived (VI 74 21 23) When Hanumān came (VI 74 24) directed him to go to the Oṣadhi Parvata and requested him to fetch four medicines that would revive the Vanaras (VI 74 26—34) At the desire of Rāma (VI 76 56 57) ran to the assistance of Aṅgada (VI 76 60) In obedience to Rāma's order (VI. 83 1 3) proceeded to the battle field with his Rkṣas to tender assistance to Hanumān (VI 83 4) But stopped on the way by Hanumān, he returned (VI 83 5 6) In response to Bibhiṣana's appeal (VI 89 7-19) fought with his Rkṣas against the followers of Indrajit (VI 89 20 24). His joy knew no bounds when Lakṣmana recovered (VI 91 28) Crushed to death the horses and demolished the chariot of Mahā-Parśva (VI 98 8 9) Overpowered by Mahā Parśva with arrow shots (VI 98 11 12) On the occasion of Rāma's coronation fetched the water of 500 rivers (VI 128 52 53) Returned home after being duly honoured with the bestowal of gifts (VI 128 85 86). Greeted and honoured by Rama (VII 39 21) Asked by Rama to stay on in the world ब्रह्मसुतः धूम्र (VII 108 33).

JYOTIR MUKHA—A Vanara chief, son of Surya, who joined the expeditionary force (VI 30 32) Attacked Ravana with a huge stone but disabled (VI 59 42—43). Wounded by Indrajit (VI 73 60)

TAKṢA—Son of Bharata, वीरः (VII 100 16). Consecrated by Rama (VII 100 19) Accompanied the invading army to Kekaya (VII 100 20)

TAKṢAKA—Defeated by Rāvana and his wife captured by force (III 32 14), (VI 7. 9)

TAKṢAŚILA—A town in Gāndhāra founded by Bharata Described (VII. 101 10—15)

TAPANA—A Rākṣasa chief who fought a duel with Gaja (VI. 43 9)

TAMASĀ, The—A river not far from the Gaṅgā, where Vālmīki used to take his bath (I. 2 3—4). Its clear water and unstained bank praised (I 2 5) Rāma arrived at its bank on the evening of the day of his exile (II. 45. 32). Crossed it the next morning शीघ्रगामा आकुलावर्तां (II. 46. 21)

TARASA—A Vānara chief who fought under Hanuman at the Western gate (VI 41 40—41)

TĀṬAKĀ— यक्षिणी कामरूपिणी, Possessed the strength of a hundred elephants, wife of Sunda Mother of the Rakṣasa—Marīca (I 24 25—27) Devastated the countries Maladās and Karūṣās (I 24. 29) Stood obstructing the path Rāma asked to kill her दुष्टचारिणी (I 24 30) Daughter of Suketu, the Yakṣa chief, बलोत्कटा came to possess the strength of a thousand elephants by the grace of Brahman On her attaining youth and beauty, married to Sunda यशस्विनी। Soon after she became the mother of Mārīca Sunda being struck dead, with her son rushed at Agastya Changed into a Rākṣasī by the great sage Thus, out of spite she devastated the region colonised by Agastya पुरुषादी, महायक्षी, विकृता, विकृतानना, दुर्वृत्ता, परमदारुणा, दुष्टपराक्रमा, शापसंसृष्टा (I 25 6—16) अधर्म्यां धर्म हि अस्यां न विद्यते (I 25 19) On hearing the twang made by Rāma with his bow string, got angry and then ran in the direction from which the sound came (I 26 7—8) नैवं दारुणम् वपुः, भिद्येरन्दर्शनादस्याः भीरूणां हृदयानि च, दुराधर्षा, मायाबलसमन्विता (I 26 10—11) On hearing the conversation that Rāma had with Lakṣmana regarding her (I 26 9—12) she made a rush at the Princes making a loud noise and whit

uplifted arms Then enveloped them in a cloud of dust and hurled stones at them (I 26 13—16) Rama stayed her stones and lopped off her arms, while Lakṣmana cut off her nose and ears कामरूपधरा Assumed various forms and at last vanished Roamed about hurling stones at them दुष्टचारिणी, यज्ञविघ्नकारिणी. Captured in a net work of arrows Rushed at the brothers with the speed of lightning Struck dead with an arrow that pierced her heart भीमसंकाशा (I 26 7—26)

TAMRA PARNĪ The—A river in the extreme South ग्राहजुष्टा, महानदी । Sugriva asked Angada to cross it after propitiating Agastya, in search of Sita (IV 41 17) Falls into the sea चित्र चन्दनवने प्रच्छन्नद्वीपवारिणी (IV 41 17—18)

TĀMRA—Daughter of Dakṣa and wife of Kaśyapa (III 14 10—12) Did not mind the proffered boon of her husband (III 14 12—13) Gave birth to five daughters—Krauñcī Bhasī Śyenī Dhṛtarāṣṭrī and Śukī (III 14 17—18)

TARA—A Vanara chief son of Bṛhaspati (I 17 11) Accompanied Sugriva to Kiṣkindhā (IV 13 4) At the request of Lakṣmana hastened with a beautiful palanquin in which the corpse of Valin was carried to the riverside (IV 25 20—26) Lakṣmana passed by his richly decorated mansion in Kiṣkindhā (IV 33 11) Joined Sugriva with five krors of Vānaras ताराद्युति (IV 39 30—31) Went to the South in search of Sitā (IV 45 6 Accompanied Angada and Hanumān to the south (IV 48 1) Searched in vain the waterless and treeless tracts of the Vindhyas (IV 48 2—23) Having ransacked the Vindhyas entered the Rkṣa cave in search of water (IV 50 1—8 Coming out of the Rkṣa cave approved of Angada's proposal of never returning home and proposed to take refuge in Maya's cave once more

(IV 53 25—26) ताराधिपवर्चस् (IV 54 1) In reply to Rāvana s enquiry (VII 34 1—3) replied that his match, Valin had gone to office the morning prayers to the four seas and that if he was impatient to meet his antagonist then he might repair to the western sea (VII 34 4—10) Created by the gods to help Rama (VII 36 47)

TĀRĀ—Wife of Valin—he took leave of her (I 1 69) Her grief foreseen by Vālmiki (1 3 24) Valin before going out to fight Dundubhi sent her away (IV 11 37) While Valin was going out to meet Sugriva in a duel, advised him not to fight with him as he had secured the alliance of Rama and Lakṣmana, but to conciliate him by appointing him the Yuvaraja (IV 15 6—30) ताराधिपनिभानना (IV 16 1) Valin having sworn to spare his brother s life (IV 16 1—10) she retired after embracing him and performing the *Svastyayana* ceremony (IV 16 11-12) प्रियवादिनी दक्षिणा (IV 16 11) मन्त्रवित् विजयैषिणी (IV 16 12) सर्वज्ञा (IV 17 41) तपस्विनी (IV 18 55) Dropped down from an eminence on hearing the news of the assassination of Valin (IV 19 3-4) Tried to stop the Vanaras who were leaving town out of fright सती (IV 19 6—9) जीवपुत्री (IV 19 11) रुचिरानना (IV 19 15) चारुहासिनी (IV 19 17) On hearing the nervous answer returned by the Vanaras out of despair went to her dying husband weeping bitterly (IV 19 17—21) Cutting Rama and Sugriva ran towards Valin and on seeing him fell flat on the ground and began to weep (IV 19 25—27) भामिनी (IV 20 2) Mourned the loss of her husband along with her co wives (IV 20 1—25) अनिन्द्यवर्णा (IV 20 26) Took to fasting out of grief (IV 20 26) Refused to leave the side of her dying husband (IV 21 12—16) when consoled by Hanuman (IV 21 1—11) पण्डिता (IV 21 5)

अनिन्दिता (IV. 21 8) सुषेणदुहिता चेयमर्थसूक्ष्मविनिश्चये ।
औत्पातिके च विविधे सर्वत: परिनिष्ठिता (IV 22 13) On the
death of Valin fell frantically on the corpse (IV 22 31)
Then smelling his face fondly bitterly regretted her
widowhood and the helpless condition of her only child
(IV 23 1-17) When Nila had extracted the deadly barb
from Valin s heart (IV 23 17—19) bathed the wound with
tears, then asked Angada to take leave of his father and in
touching words mourned his loss (IV 23 20-30) लोकश्रुता
(IV 23 1) Rama saw her lying in the battle field
embracing the corpse of Valin, surrounded by the ministers
who were trying to separate her (IV 24 25-26) कपिसिंहनाथा
अदीनसत्त्वा (IV 24 26) मृगशावनेत्रा (IV 24 28) While
being removed recognised Rama and rushing towards him
frantically prayed that she too, might be put to death like
Valin And then assured him that by so doing he would not
commit a fresh sin as she was part and parcel of Valin s soul
(IV 24 27-41) आर्या (IV 24 29) मनस्विनी (IV 24 30)
वीरपत्नी सुवेशरूपा Held her peace when consoled by Rama
(IV 24 44) Followed the funeral procession of Valin
weeping bitterly (IV 25 35—36) Mourned the death of
her husband when the bier was placed on the river bank
till separated by other Vanaris (IV 25 39—48) Offered
water in memory of Valin (IV 25 51—53) Appropriated
by Sugriva on the death of Valin (IV 29 4) Saluted by
Angada (IV 31 37) At the desire of Sugriva went out to
meet Laksmana प्रियदर्शना, सुभ्रू , अनिन्दिता, प्रस्खलन्ती, मद-
विह्वलाक्षी, प्रलम्बकाञ्चीगुणहेमसूत्रा सुलक्षणा, नमितागयष्टि (IV 33
31—38) In her drunken state enquired about the cause
of Laksmana s wrath (IV 33 40—41) कार्यतत्त्वज्ञा (IV 33
49) In reply to Laksmana s charges against Sugriva
(IV 33 43—49) made excuses on his behalf and assured

him that steps had already been taken to muster the Vānaras from all quarters, then requested him to see the king in the harem (IV 33 50—61) Tried to appease the wrath of Lakṣmana (IV 35. 1—23). Her appropriation by Sugrīva during the temporary absence of Vālin recalled (IV. 46 9). At the desire of Sugrīva (VI 123 29—32) got ready with other Vānara ladies and took her seat on the car bound for Ayodhyā सर्वांगशोभना (VI. 123 33—37).

TĀREYA—A Vanara chief, created to help Rāma (VII. 36 47)

TĀRKṢYAS, The—Produced Vānara children who could render aid to Rāma (I 17. 21).

TĀLAJANGHĀS—The Rājā of which country defeated Asita (I 70 27-29)

TIMIDHVAJA—Vide Śambara (II 9. 12-13).

TUMBURU—A Gandharva chief, whose services were requisitioned by Bharadvāja in the matter of entertaining the army of Bharata (II 91 18) Sang in the presence of Bharata (II 91 46). Cursed by Kuvera assumed the form of Virādha for his excessive attachment for Rambha (III. 4 16 19)

TRNABINDU—Lived in his hermitage near the Meru Hills (VII 2 7) राजर्षिः (VII 2 14) On finding that his daughter manifested all signs of pregnancy (VII 2. 17) enquired what the matter was (VII 2. 19) On hearing the answer of his daughter (VII. 2 20 22) through meditation came to know the actual facts, then taking the girl with him to Pulastya requested him to accept her as his wife (VII 2 23 26) तपसा द्योतितप्रभः (VII 2 23)

TRNABINDU'S DAUGHTER—Ignorant of the curse of Pulastya (VII 2 12-13) went near her father's hermitage in search of her companions Instantaneously she was

big with a child Being perturbed approached her father (VII 2 14 18) In reply to her father's anxious enquiries (VII 2 19) faithfully described what had come to pass (VII 2 20 22) Married to Pulastya (VII 2 27) pleased him mightily through her self less devotion (VII 2 28 29) By favour of Pulastya gave birth to a son Viśravā by name (VII 2 32)

TORAṆA—Bharata on his way back from Kekaya passed through the south of this village (II 71 11)

TRIKŪṬA—Name of a hill in Laṅka seated on which Hanuman took a view of Laṅka (V 2 1) On the pointed peak of which was situated Laṅka (VI 39 17 19) Its caves rang with the din of battle (VI 44 26)

TRIJAṬĀ (i)—A Brahmana of the Gargya family, tawny coloured, lived in the forests on roots etc. which he dug up (उञ्छवृत्ति) (II 32 29) The old man had a young wife and a brood of children (II 32 30) At his wife's suggestion approached Rama and related his poverty (II 32 30 35) Lustrous like Bhṛgu and Angirasa (II 32 33) At the suggestion of Rāma threw his stick which covered the cow preserve of Rama on the other bank of the Sarayū (II 32 37 38) Received all those cows (II 32 39) Retired with his wife blessing Rāma profusely महामुनि (II 32 43)

TRIJAṬĀ (ii)—A Rākṣasī Her dream foreseen by Vālmīki (I 3 31) वृद्धा Finding that the Rākṣasīs were scolding Sītā told them that she had dreamt horrible dreams (V 27 4 6) On enquiry (V 27 7 8) described her dreams that indicated the victory of Rāma over the Rākṣasas and the destruction of Rāvaṇa and his relatives Then asked the Rākṣasīs not to behave rudely with their captive (V 27 9 46) Sent for by Rāvaṇa (VI 47 6) At the desire of Rāvaṇa (VI 47 5 10) placed Sītā on the Puṣpaka car and kept her company

during flight (VI. 47. 11-14). Never told a lie before nor was she prepared to do so in future (VI. 48.29). Advancing various reasons tried to impress the idea on Sitā's mind that the princes were not dead (VI. 48. 22-33). Returned to the Aśoka Park along with Sitā (VI. 48. 35-36).

TRIPURA—The three cities which Śiva pierced with the bow and arrows given him by the Devas (I. 75. 12). Referred to (III. 64. 72) (V. 54. 30) (VI. 71. 74).

TRIŚANKU—Thought of proceeding to heaven by celebrating a sacrifice. सत्यवादी जितेन्द्रियः (I. 57. 10-12). Vasistha having ridiculed the idea (I. 57. 12-13), approached his hundred sons who also refused to undertake the task Finding him determined to carry out his purpose with extraneous help, they cursed him (I. 58 2-9). On the morning following became a Candala (I. 58. 10-11). Deserted by the ministers and citizens (I. 58. 11-12). All alone approached Viśvāmitra who pitied him. Rājā of Ayodhyā (I. 58. 12-16). At the desire of Viśvāmitra, narrated his previous history, then appealed to him to take up his cause merely to establish the superiority of Human Endeavour over Providence. मया चेष्टं क्रतुशतम् अनृतं नोक्तपूर्वम् प्रजा धर्मेण पालिता गुरवश्च महात्मानः शीलवृत्तेन तोषिताः (I. 58. 17-24). वाक्यज्ञः (I. 58. 17). Viśvāmitra promised to take up his cause सुधार्मिकः नृपपुंगवः (I. 59 2-5). Deputed to heaven on the responsibility of Viśvāmitra (I. 60. 15-16). धर्मिष्ठः वदान्यः (I. 60. 2). Extradjcted by Indra and other Devas, fell head foremost (I. 60 16-18). His fall stayed by Viśvāmitra (I 60. 20). Out of wrath created a fresh heaven for him with its stars and planets and then proceeded to create a fresh set of Devas (I. 60. 21-23). On this the Devas approached him and a compromise was arrived at according to which the Rājā was to live head downwards in the midst of the fresh heaven created by the Rṣi

(I 60 f30 33) Son of Prthu and er of Dhundumārasht (I 70 24)

TRIŚIRĀ (i)—A Rākṣasa of Janasthana killed by Rama (I 1 47) His death foreseen by Valmiki (I 3 20) A general of Duṣana (III 23 33) Only he along with Khara remained alive of the 14,000 soldiers of Khara (III 26 35 37) वाहिनीपति (III 27 1) Persuaded Khara to allow him to fight with Rama before he himself went to give battle (III 27 1 5) Having received the permission (III 27 6) drove towards Rama discharging sharp arrows and making a fearful noise (III 27 7—8) Put up a stiff fight and wounded Rama on the forehead (III 27 10 11) 14 arrows discharged by Rama pierced his heart his horses and charioteer killed (III 27 13—15) His three heads lopped off by means of 3 arrows (III 27 16 18)

TRIŚIRĀ (ii)—यशस्वी शशिप्रकाश Accompanied Rāvana to the battle field holding a sharp pike in his hand and rid ing on a bull (VI 59 19) Nephew of Kumbhakarna who mourned the loss of his uncle (VI 68 7) Consoled Rāvana and offered to go to the battle field himself (VI 69 1 7) A son of Rāvana शक्रतुल्यपराक्रम धीर अन्तरिक्षगत मायाविशारद त्रिदशदर्पघ्न समरदुर्मद सुबलसम्पन्न विस्तीर्णकीर्ति Never suffered a defeat अस्त्रविद् युद्धविशारद प्रवरविज्ञान लब्धवर शत्रुबलार्दन भास्करतुल्यदर्शन (VI 69 10 14) Son of Rāvana started for the battle field taking leave of Rāvana (VI 69 17—19) Went to the battle field driving in a chariot and holding a bow and arrows in his hand (VI 69 22 24) On the death of Narāntaka made a rush at Aṅgada driving in a chariot (VI 70 1-4) In the course of the fight cut off the trees and stones flung at him and wounded Aṅgada on the forehead with arrows (VI 70 6—19) Fought with Nila (VI 70 22) (VI 70 26) Fought a contested duel

with Hanumān in the course of which lost his horse, arms and ultimately his life (VI. 70. 32-48).

TVAṢṬĀ—One of the Ādityas: went out bravely to fight against the Rākṣasas (VII. 27. 36).

DAKṢA—Jayā and Suprabhā were his daughters (I. 21. 15). The destruction of his sacrifice referred to (I. 66. 9). A Prajāpati who followed Pulaha (III. 14. 9). Had sixty daughters (III. 14. 10).

DAṆḌA (i)—A Rākṣasa chief, son of Sumālin and Ketumatī (VII. 5. 38-39).

DAṆḌA (ii)— The youngest son of Ikṣvāku, मूढः अकृतविद्यः अल्पतेजाः; deputed to rule over the country lying between the Vindhya and the Śaivala hills. Founded the town Madhumanta—his capital, and appointed Uśanā his priest. Thus he ruled mightily over the kingdom (VII. 79. 14-20). दान्तात्मा (VII. 80. 2). सुदुर्मेधाः (VII. 80. 5). Once in the month of Caitra visited his priest's hermitage; there coming across the beautiful Arajā, the eldest daughter of the Ṛṣi, was overcome by desire, and enquired who she was and made his proposal (VII. 80. 1-6). In spite of her refusal (VII. 80. 7-12) raped her and departed (VII. 80. 13-17). Following upon the curse pronounced by Śukra (VII. 81. 1-15) his kingdom was buried deep in an ash-hill in a week (VII. 81. 17-18).

DAṆḌAKA—A forest to which Rāma retired for fear of being disturbed by the citizens of Ayodhyā (I. 1. 40). There he killed Virādha and saw Agastya and other Ṛṣis (I. 1. 41). Being requested by the Ṛṣis promised to kill the Rākṣasas who haunted the forest (I. 1. 45). There he disfigured Śūrpaṇakhā and killed 14000 Rākṣasas including Khara

and Duṣaṇa (I 1 46 48) Rāvana abducted Sita from that place (I 1 53) Rāma's visit to that place foreseen by Valmiki (I 3 17) Situated in the South (II 9 12) Kaikeyī proposed that Rāma should retire there in the garb of an ascetic (II 11 26 27) (II 18 33) Rāma consented to retire there for fourteen years (II 19 11) Rama spoke to Kausalya about his impending banishment there (II 20 30 31) Rāma s banishment there referred to by Kaikeyī (II 72 42) Rama etc entered (III 1 1) Its beautiful scenery described (III 8 12 15) Once Marica roamed about devouring the Rṣis (III 38 3) Viśvamitra s hermitage was there (III 38 12 13) Thence Marīca was thrown into the sea situated at the distance of a hundred Yojanas by Rāma (III 38 19) Rāvana and Marīca arrived in the vicinity of Rāma's hermitage (III 42 11 12) Lakṣmana ransacked it in search of Sitā in vain (III 61 23) Sugriva asked Angada to go there in search of Sita (IV 41 11) Called after Raja Daṇḍa, lying between the Vindhyas and the Śaivala hills (VII 81 18 19) Also called Janasthana (VII 81 20)

DANḌIN—A door keeper of Surya, who carried Ravaṇa s message delivered by Prahasta to Sūrya and brought His reply (VII 23 (b) 8 14)

DADHIVAKTRA—A Vanara chief Lakṣmana passed by his richly decorated house at Kiṣkindha (IV 33 11) Maternal uncle of Sugrīva who was in charge of the Madhu Vana (V 61 9) महावीर Roughly handled by the intoxicated Vanaras for trying to do his duty (V 61 20 24) हरिवृद्धवीर. उग्रतेजा· (V 61 21) When the guards reported the destruction of the forest at the hands of the Vānaras (V 62 17) attacked the intruders with a tree when Angada dashed him to the ground for his impudence (V 62 18 27) Taking counsel with his guards went to Sugriva to report the fact

(V. 62. 28-38). Sugrīva having given him assurances (V. 63. 1-3) lodged a complaint against the Vānaras who had ravaged the preserved forest (V. 63. 4-12). मधुप्रभः (V. 63. 4). Taking his departure thence returned to Madhu Vana, begged of Angada to excuse him and delivered Sugrīva's message (V. 64. 1-12). Son of Candra (VI. 30. 22). Wounded by Indrajit (VI. 73. 60). Greeted and honored by Rāma (VII. 39 22).

DANŪ—A daughter of Dakṣa and wife of Kaśyapa (III. 14. 10-11). Became the mother of Aśvagrīva by favour of her husband (III. 14. 11-16). One of her sons was Kabandha (III. 71. 7).

DANTAVAKTRA—A courtier of Rāma who with light talks sought to divert his master (VII. 43. 2).

DAMAYANTĪ—Daughter of Bhīma; the devoted wife of Naiṣadha (V. 24. 12).

DARADAS, The—A country. Sugrīva asked Śatabala to ransack the towns in the north in search of Sītā (IV. 43 12)

DARĪMUKHA—A Vānara chief who in response to Sugrīva's call supplied 1000 krors of Vānaras (IV. 39. 24). श्रीमान् Joined Sugrīva with 10 krors of Vānaras (IV. 39. 36-37). Hurried on the Vānaras of the invading army during its march to the South (VI 4 36) Greeted and honored by Rāma (VII. 39. 22).

DARDURAS, The—The breeze from those mountains blew in the hermitage of Bharadvāja (II. 91. 24).

(To be Continued).

VII —INDEX TO SABARA'S BHASYA

(Bib Ind Edn)

(Cont from Vol VI, p 18)

By the Late Col G A Jacob

" अंशु गृह्णात्यदाभ्य गृह्णाति " (cf Apast Srauta XII 7 17),—440

" अंशुरंशुस्ते सोमाप्यायताम् ' (TS 1 2 11 1),—72

अक्ष्यामये मुद्गौदनो भोक्तव्य ,—8

अक्ष्यामये मुद्गौदनभोजन निवातशय्या च,—520, 403

अगतिकागति —500

" अगन्मस्व सज्योतिषा भूम " 136 (VS ii 25 Satap 1 9 3 14)

" अग्नये कृत्तिकाभ्य etc ' (TB 3 1 4 1)—,434

" अग्नये गृहपतय आशूनामष्टाकपाल निर्वपेत् etc " (cf TS 1 8 10 1),—750, 789

" अग्नये छागस्य वपाया etc ",—239

" अग्नये जुष्ट निर्वपामि " (I offer to Agni that wh is pleasing cf VS i 10, ii 1),—170, 235

" अग्नये ज्योतिष्मत etc," 278, 280

" अग्नये पवमानाय अग्नये पावकाय etc " (TS 2 2 4 2),—458, 460, 774

" अग्नये रक्षोघ्नेऽष्टाकपाल निर्वपेद्यो रक्षोभ्यो विभीयात् ' ,—829

" अग्नये शुचये ' ,—100—1, 872

" अग्नये स्विष्टकृते समवद्यति ",—843—4

" अग्नि a list of 6 synonyms is given, amongst which is शाण्डिल्य,—454

" अग्निं स्तोमेन बोधय etc " (R V V 14 1),—461

" अग्निं स्विष्टकृत यजति etc ,—391, 462, 590

" अग्निं चित्वा सौत्रामण्या यजेत (TS 5 6 34),—355

" अग्निभ्यः कामेभ्यः पशवः आलभ्यन्ते etc.",—323.
" अग्निमग्ने आवह सोममावह etc.",—231, 317, 593.
" अग्निमुपनिधाय स्तुवते "(गर्गत्रिरात्रे),—48.
" अग्निं मथ्नन्ति प्रस्तुवो भवन्ति ",—15.
" अग्निं युनज्मि शवसा घृतेन etc.",—751,—2.
" अग्निर्देवो दैव्यो होता देवान्यक्षत् ",—817.
" अग्निर्मूर्धा दिवः",—960, 84 (अग्निर्ह).
" अग्निर्मे होता स मे होता etc." (cf. Aśv. Grihya 1.23.7),—
352, 817(अग्निर्होता).
" अग्निर्वसुभिः सोमो रुद्रैः etc.",—814.
" अग्निर्वै देवानां पथिकृत् etc.",—848.
" अग्निष्टुत् (see Vol. I),—472.
" अग्निष्टोमः पञ्चोक्थ्यः etc.",—103.
" अग्निष्टोमं प्रथममाहरति",—308.
" अग्निष्टोमे राजन्यस्य गृह्णीयात् etc.",—494, 496, 501.
" अग्निष्टोमो वै प्रजापतिः etc.",—97.
" अग्निष्टा द्वे द्वे रशने आदाय etc.",—76.
अग्नि होत्रवेलायामागन्तव्यम्,—765.
" अग्निहोत्रहवण्या हवींषि निर्वपति ",—375 (Āpast. Śr. 1.
17. 10).
" अग्नीधेऽग्ने ददाति etc.",—416
" अग्नीवरुणौ स्विष्टकृतौ यजति,—464
" अग्नीषोमीयपशु (see Vol. I),—272, 311, 318
" अग्नीषोमीयमष्टाकपालं निर्वपेत् श्यामाकं ब्रह्मवर्चसकाम,—612
" अग्नीषोमीयं पशु पुरोडाशं ..निर्वपति ",—798.
" अग्नीषोमीयं पशुमालभेत ",—798, 868.
" अग्नीषोमीयस्य पशुपुरोडाशमनु देवसू हवींषि निर्वपति ",—843.
" अग्नीषोमीयस्य वपया etc.",—318, 465, 797, 799.
" अग्नेरुज्जितिमनूज्जेषं etc ",—(TS 1.6 4.1),—136, 457.
" अग्ने व्रतपतये चरिष्यामि ",—811.
अग्र्यप्राये लिखितोऽग्र्यः (Vol. I),—93.

अङ्गभूयस्त्वेन फलभूयस्त्वम्,—566, 673.
अङ्गिरसां द्विरात्रः,—503.
" अङ्गिरसो वा इत उत्तमाः स्वर्गमायन् etc." (TS. 2.6.3. 2),—84.
" अङ्गुष्ठपर्वमात्रं etc.",—339.
" अङ्गवासः परिधत्ते ",—876.
अच्छ (ind) 'towards,' 'obtaining, taking possession of' (Goldstucker) ; Śabara explains it by आप्तुम् in X. 1. 91,—311—12.
" अजया क्रीणाति etc.",—423, 863.
" अजर्षभस्याजिनमवस्तृणाति ",—379.
अजामिकरण,—651, 656, 660.
अजामित्व (in Sūtra),—660.
अजावशा (see वशा in Vol. i),—459, 460.
अञ्जनाभ्यञ्जन (?),—445.
" अञ्जन्ति त्वामध्वरे देवयन्तः ",—859.
" अणुना अव्यवच्छिन्नया धारया गृह्णाति ",—511.
" अतस्त्वं देववनस्पते etc." (VS. V. 43),—313.
" अतस्त्वामग्नि शासहस्तं etc." 275.
अतिचर to offend, be unfriendly to (an ācarya etc.),—361, 758.
" अतिजगतीषु स्तुवन्ति ", 202—3.
अतिथिवत्,—137, 146.
अतिदेश, 'transference (of the details of a sacrifice)',—10 ; its varieties, 11.
अतिभार (See Vol. i) as in the sentence नास्ति वचनस्यातिभारः in every case, as also in the instances noted in Vol. i ; and may mean 'this statement is not of much weight,' on p. 300 it may mean 'obscurity,'—3, 300, 558, 872
" अतिरात्रे गृह्णाति षोडशिनम् " (see Vol. i),—629.
अतिरात्रे ब्राह्मणस्य etc.", 494—6.

" अत्सरुकैश्चमसैः सोमान्भक्षयन्ति " (Āpast Śr 23 10 11, Tāndya Brāh 25 4. 4 अत्सरुक, 'having no handle'),—352
" अथ पृषदाज्यं गृह्णाति etc ",—473, 475.
" अथ य कामयेत् वसीयान् श्रेयान् स्या etc ",—775.
" अथ यद्यूपपरिशिष्यते etc " (?),—586
" अथातोऽग्निष्टोमेनानुयजति etc ",—518, 638
" अथेडामेवावद्यति etc ",—600
" अथैतां दिशामवेक्ष्य etc ",—773
" अथैव एकत्रिक etc ",—482, 484
" अथैवभूर्वभ्यदेव etc ",—419
" अथो खल्वाहु कापेया दक्षिणस्य etc ",—577
अदक्षिणानि सत्राणि,—352 See RV VI 51 1
" अदब्ध चक्षु ",—792
" अदिति पाश प्रमुमोक्तेतम् " 242 (i e प्रमुमोक्तु एतम् for मुमोक्तु —See RV 1 24 12)
" अदीक्षिता अहीनैर्यजन्ति ",—139 (RV X 116 7)
" अद्भ्यस्त्वौषधीभ्यो जुष्टं प्रोक्षामि "—92
" अद्य सुत्यामागच्छ ",—754
अध्यूध्नी, a tubular vessel above the udder (ऊधन्),—585
" अध्यूध्नीं होत्रे हरन्ति " (Āpast Ś R VII 26. 7 with हरति),—585
अध्रिगु (See TB 3 1 6 4, also Goldstucker and Vedic Index Under Ait Brāh 6 Sayana defines it as कश्चिद्देव पशुविशसनस्य कर्ता),—250, 272, 277, 795—6
अध्वरकल्पेष्टि (see Vol i),—712
" अध्वरस्य पूर्वमथाग्ने रूपायिऽहोत्रकर्म यदग्निकर्म ",—401, 834
" अध्वर्युर्गृहपतिं दीक्षयित्वा etc ",—418, 761
अनङ्ग प्रधान कस्मैचित्प्रयोजनाय न कल्पते,—59
अनन्वारभ्य, 'without taking hold of ' (?),—67.
अनभोज्य,—607

"अनया त्वापात्रेण समुद्ररक्षया etc.',—552, 554.

अनवानम्, 'without breathing between,' without interruption (as अनवानं गायति. See Vol. i),—198.

"अनस्थिमिरिद्दां वर्धयन्ति",—586, 588 (Āpast. Śrauta VII. 24. 11).

"अनांसि प्रवर्तयन्ति',—809.

अनारभ्यवाद (see Vol. i),—44, 68, 121—3, 621, 636 (वचन).

अनारभ्यविधान,—160, 503, 620, 635, 760 (all but the last are in Sūtras).

अनारभ्याधीत,—121, 642.

अनारभ्याभिहित,—247.

अनारभ्याम्नायते,—635. TS. V. 4. 312.

"अनाहुतिर्वै जर्तिलाश्च गवेधुकाश्च',—625—6. See TS. I. 8.4.1

अनीकवत् (adj.), having or occupying the prominent or principal place, principal, superior, first,—an epithet of Agni, and used chiefly when the god receives the first offerings in certain sacrifices etc. (Goldstucker),—711.

अनुप्रयोग (Pāṇini iii.4. 4),—676.

अनुमति (see Vol. i),—308—9.

"अनुयाजेष्वग्निं स्विष्टकृतं यजति',—466.

अनुवाक्या (see Vol. i),—84.

अनुषङ्ग (see Vol. i), - 730.

"अनुसवनं सवनीयाः पुरोडाशा निरूप्यन्ते पिहित्यै etc.",—826, 837—8.

अनूक, 'the back bone',—581.

अनूचीत, 'coming after, successive,'—45—6, 68.

अनेकस्याप्येकः शब्दो भवति वाचकः (i. e माता may mean either *mother* or measurer),—314.

अनेकार्थविधानमन्याय्यम् (cf. अन्यायश्चानेकार्थत्वम् infra),—271.
" अनो ददाति ",—46.
अन्तरङ्गबहिरङ्गयोश्चान्तरङ्गं बलीयः,—835.
अन्तरागर्भिणी न्याय,—238, 424.
" अन्तर्वेदि अन्यः पादो हेतुर्भवति बहिर्वेदि अन्यः ",—725.
" अन्तर्वेदि तिष्ठन्सावित्राणि जुहोति ",—121, 128.
" अन्तर्वेद्यां हवींष्यासादयति ",—336.
अन्त्यलोप,—479. Cf. Āpast. Śrauta xi. 21. 8.
" अन्यां यजमानस्य व्रतधुकां आशिरे दुहन्ति ". Quoted in Bhāmatī 1. 3. 17.
अन्यायश्चानेकार्थत्वम्,—32, 38 ; cf. 51 and 326.
अन्येषां चाग्नेयेन चापयति etc. ",—75.
" अन्वहं द्वादशशतं ददाति ",—569, 571
अन्वचय (see Vol. i) —412.
अन्वादिश्,—361.
अन्वादेश,—353.
अन्वारुह्य वचनमिदम् (cf. अन्वारुह्यवाद in Parimala, p. 321),—259.
अन्वाहार्य (see Vol.),—404—5, 725, 880.
अप· प्रणेष्यन्वात्वं गच्छति etc ",—750.
अपचय, 'diminution' (see उपचय) —106.
", अपचितावध्येकाहे बृहद्रथन्तरे कुर्वीत ' " (cf. Āpast. Śr. xxii 12. 2 etc. See Garbe),—534, 544.
" अपबर्हिषः प्रयाजान्यजति ",—482, 607—8 (cf. Āpast. Śrauta viii 8. 6).
" अपबर्हिषावनुयाजौ यजति ",—482, 607—8 (Āpast viii 8. 10 etc. .
अपर आह,—133, 693 722
" अपरेण गार्हपत्यं प्राग्ग्रीवम् etc. ",—151
" अपनु मे नामोऽभवात् etc. ",—608, (Āpast Śr. viii—8. 7).

" अप वा एष स्वर्गाल्लोकाच्छिद्यते यो दर्शपूर्णमासयाजी सन्पौर्णमासीममावास्यां वाऽतिपातयेत् ",—663.

अपाट्कार (?),—457. (In Mādhava's Nyāyamālāvistara the reading is अपाट्कार.)

" अपालग्नेः प्रिया धामानि etc ",—457. Mādhava has अपाग्नेः etc.)

" अप्रतिष्ठिता वै त्र्यम्बकाः ",—124—5.

अप्रयाजास्ता अननुयाजाः,—605—6.

अप्राप्ते शास्त्रमर्थवत्,—792.

" अप्सु तृणं प्रास्या घारमाघारयति ",—385, 718.

" अप्सुदीक्षां प्रवेशयित्वा देवाः स्वर्गं लोकमायन् etc ",—779.

" अप्सुमन्तावाज्यभागौ यजति ",—608, 655 (Āpast. Śr. viii. 8. 7).

" अप्स्वग्ने सधिष्टव etc. ",—608 (RV. viii. 43 9).

" अप्स्ववभृथेन चरन्ति ",—717, 740.

" अभिघार्या इतिमीमांसन्ते ",—627.

" अभिजिता यजेत ",—(Āpast. xvii. 26. 12), 77.

" अभित उभयतो ज्योतिर्मध्ये षडहः पशुकामो यजेत ",—842.

" अभितः सौम्यमाग्नेयौ भवतः ",—700.

" अभितो दिवाकीर्त्यमहस्त्रयः स्वरसामानो भवन्ति ",—45

" अभित्वा ", (the first words of RV. vii 32. 22. viz. अभि त्वा शूर नोनुमः । So Mādhava 21, 51, 188, 203.

" अभिप्लवोऽन्वहं भवति ",—64.

अभिमर्शन,—85.

अभिवत्य. (from अभिवन्त, 'having the prep अभि', as in RV. vii. 32. 22 quoted above, and see Sāṅkh Śrauta vii. 20. 3),—20, 21, 24. 24.

" अभीपूषा पतो यदस्य यदाघारो etc." (See vol. i),—318.

" अभ्यातानं जुहोति ",—10. In Pâraskara Gṛihya i. 5. 7 अभ्यातानाः is rendered "formulas aiming at hostile

powers." A list of them is given in 1. 5. 10. *Sacred Books o' the East*, Vol xxix, pp 279—80.

अभ्युदय, befriend, 300, 661

अभ्युदयेष्टि (see Vol i),—288.

" अमावास्यायां निशि यजेत,'—828, 830

" अमावास्या सुभगा सुशेवा," 231 (Āpast. Śr. ii. 20. 5)

अमीपिष्ठ पिण्डाः स्निग्धाः क्रियन्तां,—31, 111, 277.

"अमृत वा आज्यं मर्त्यं हविः etc,"—660

" अमृताहुतिमेवैतां करोति,—338.

अमेध्यद्रव्य,—51

अम्ल, 'sour curds', (अम्लेनापि कांजिकादिना [आमिक्षा] क्रियते),—95

अयं घटस्त्रिषु नागदन्तकेषु स्थाप्यताम्,—195

" अयं यजमान आयुराशास्ते etc ",—174, 367—8 (TS. 2 6. 9. 7)

अयजुषा वत्सानपाकरोति etc.",—285—6 (cf. Āpast. Śr. viii. 9. 11)

अयुतमभिषेचनीये ददाति,—773 (see अभिषेचनीय in Vol. i)

अयुतं पौण्डरीके ददाति etc ",—566

अये यजामहक (see येयजामहे in the Index),—621.

अरुणपराशरा नाम शाखिनः तेषां परिचरेषु स्मृतिरूपं ब्राह्मणं भवति,—9 (Who were these worthies?).

" अरुणया पिंगाक्ष्या etc " (TS. 6 1. 6 7),—5

" अर्धं परिवपेत् लुनाति अर्धं न,"—56

अर्धिन्, 'one who receives half,'—418 (See Manu viii 210, and Buhler's note).

" अलंकृत्याभिपूर्य उपांशु यष्टव्यः,—17.

अवट (in यूपावट) a hole in the ground for a sacrificial post,—43

अवभृथ,—expiatory bath,—37—9, 191, 607, 707.

" अवभृथादागत्य वत्सत्वचं परिधत्ते ",—842

" अवरबो विष सपत्नं बध्यासम् ",—787.

अविहितेतिकर्तव्यताक,—120.
"अवी द्वे धेनू ददाति etc.", —379.
"अवृतः सामिधेनी रन्वाह",—819.
अवेष्टि (See vol. i),—773.
"अशीतिशतमाग्नेयं etc." (Sloka),—490.
"अश्वः श्यावो रुक्मललाटो दक्षिणा" (cf. Āpast Śr. xxii. 6. 9),—428—21—719.
अश्वकर्ण,—313.
अश्वधेनु,—58. (See धेनु)
अश्वप्रतिग्रहेष्टि (See vol. i),—786.
"अश्वशफेन क्रीणाति,"—813.
अष्टका (See vol. i),—116—7.
अष्टका चरु,—55.
अष्टरात्र,—842.
"अष्टा कपालः प्रातः सवने etc",—525.
"अष्टाक्षरेण प्रथमाया ऋचः प्रस्तौति",—527.
"अष्टाक्षरेण प्रथमायामृचि प्रस्तौति",—198.
अष्टावध्वर्युरुत्तरे विहारे हवींष्यासादयति etc."—719,721,755.
असकृद्वचनं शब्देनानुबध्यमानमन्यमिव व्यपदिशति",—317.
असति न्याये लिङ्गमकारणम्,—58.
असन्निहिते हि स्वस्मिन्न्याये देवदत्तोयज्ञदत्तमानमारोहति,—806.
असोमपीथ, one who is not allowed to drink the Soma-juice (e.g. a Kṣattriya or Vaiśya),—880.
असोमयाजिन्,—643—5.
अस्तुतशस्त्र (See स्तुतशस्त्र in vol I),—501.
अस्थियज्ञ,—362—370, 372.
"अहतवासः परिधत्ते",—447.
अहर्गण, a series of days,—63, 153, 485,572,574, 749, 753.
अहीन (See vol i), 504, 566.
अहुताद्, not an eater of the offerings (Kṣatriyas etc. See Ait. B V. VII. 19 and Eggeling's note on 4.5.2.16),—881.

" अहेर्बुध्नियमन्त्रं मे गोपाय etc" (TB I 1 10.3),—1889
" आकूतिमग्निं प्रयुजं स्वाहा etc.",—398 (TS. 4.1.9 1)
"आकूत्यै प्रयुजेऽग्नये स्वाहा"—398, (TS. 1.2.2.1)
आख्याविकार,—3-4—5.
"आग्नावैष्णवं ..निर्वपेत् सरस्वत्यै etc,"—100, 164, 307, 309, 711 (modified).
" आग्नावैष्णवं निर्वपेद्दीक्षिष्यमाणः etc.' (TS 5 5 1 4),—308, 366, 813, 834
" आग्निमारुतादूर्ध्वमनुयाजैश्चरन्ति ",—764, 838.
"आग्नेय,—84.
आग्नेयः पशुरग्निष्टोमे आलब्धव्यः etc (See vol. i),—180.
" आग्नेय कृष्णग्रीवमालभेत etc,"—699, 782 (cf. Apast. XX. 13, 12).
" आग्नेयं चतुर्धा करोति ",—648 (TS 2 2 3 3)
" आग्नेयं ..निर्वपेद्रुक्काम ,"—612—13
" आग्नेयं पय ",—85
" आग्नेया ग्रहा भवन्ति ",—472.
" आग्नेयी सुब्रह्मण्या भवति ",—175
" आग्नेये वैकृते पशौ etc,"—239.
" आग्नेयोऽष्टाकपालो हिरण्यं दक्षिणा ',—773.
आग्रयण (see vol i),—17,46,404,497,500,506,840
" आग्रयणाद्गृह्णाति षोडशिनम्",—498,500
आग्रहायणी कर्म,—55
" आघारमाघारयति ",—606
आचार्ये प्रोषिते आचार्यानी भवनामाचार्यः,—25
आजिसृत, 'fighting or running for a prize' (MW),—582.
आज्ञु होता (?),—119—3
आज्यप,—473, 475
" आज्यभागाभ्यां प्रचर्य etc,'—653,655
" आज्यभागौ यजति,"—316, 318, 512,—3, 608
" आज्यभागौ यजति चक्षुषी एव नान्तरेति ",—310

"आज्यस्यैव चरुमभिपूर्य etc,"—330.
"आज्यस्यैव नाउपांशु पौर्णमास्यां यजन्",—650,653,658.
"आज्यार्धर्चां वसां जुहोति,"—295,297.
"आज्यैः स्तुवते etc ,"—193.
"आतिथ्यं निरवदन् etc ,"—604.
"आतिथ्येष्टि, 'guest—offering' to Soma (vol i),—40.7.
"आदित्यः प्रायणीयः पयसि चरुः",—283, 329 and 738 omit पयसि. Cf. Apast X. 4.4.
"आदित्यं घृते चरुं निर्वपेत् etc ",—125.
"आदित्यो यूपः," said of the *glittering* yūpa after it has been *oiled*,—624.
आदिमत्त्वादोषो वेदस्य,—142
आधानिक, concerned with the laying of sacred fire,—874.
आधूननार्था मन्त्राः,—486.
आपराग्निक होम,—726.
आपेक्षिक, 'relative',—413,686.
आभाषान्तं सूत्रम्,—16,37,230,697,707,756,764.
आभिचारिक, 'malevolent' (as the इषु and श्येन sacrifices),—11.
"आमनमस्य etc" (TS.2.3 9 3),—442.
आमनहोम (See vol i),—442.
आमिक्षा (ditto),—94,95
आम्र (यथा 'अयमाम्रो यज्ञदत्तस्य पुत्रः', यथा 'आम्रेपुत्रवाद.'),—38.
आयुराशिस् (in Sūtra),—373—4
"आयुर्दा अग्ने असि आयुर्मे देहि",—860 (TS.1.5.5.3).
आरण्यभोजन,—815.
"आरम्भणीया (इष्टि),—164,307,309,831 (See Index to Jhā's Prabh. Mīmā.).
आरादुपकारक,—134, 312, 466, 467 (distinguished from सामवायिक)

आर्त्विज्य, pertains to Brāhmaṇas only, and not to Kṣatriyas or Vaiśyas,—879.
आर्थपत्य, lordship over things,—139.
आथर्वकाल (See बहिष्पवमान in Index to vol i),—763—4.
" आथर्वे प्रस्तूयमाने etc.",—371 (Āpast. xxii. 7. 24 ; Tāṇḍya xvii. 12. 5).
आवाप, repetition of something, as of the अनुलेपन of each of a number of Brāhmaṇas—(opp. of तन्त्र),—661.
आवापिक, 'additional', 'interested',—466—7.
आवापोद्वाप,—453, 661.
आवाहनवत् (in sūtra),—781.
" आवृत्तं धूर्षु स्तुवते etc.",—485, 490, 494
" अवृत्तंपृष्ठ्यं षडहमुपयन्ति,—548.
आशितं भव 'that which satisfies,' 'satiety,' (Pāṇini iii 2. 45),—413
आशिर, milk mixed with Soma juice (See Vedic Index),—760—1.
" आशीर्भिः प्रस्तरं प्रहरति",—748.
आश्रये प्रवर्तमाने तदाश्रितमपि प्रवर्तते (e.g. if a piece of cloth is moved the figuring on it moves also),—81.
" आश्रावयेति चतुरक्षरमस्तु etc.",—620 (TS. 1. 6 11. 1).
" आश्रुत प्रत्याश्रुते अजैदग्निः ",—796.
" आश्ववालः प्रस्तरः ",—388 (Āpast. x. 39 3., TS. vi. 2 1. 5)
" आश्विनं ग्रहं गृह्णाति " (Śatapa. iv. 2 5.12),—90, 711 and 837 (गृहीत्वा etc.) Cf TS vi. 2. 7. 1, 2.
" आश्विनाग्रान् गृह्णीयादामयाविनः etc" —512, 514, 515—16.
" आसारितकं गायति " (?),—26, 28.
" आसीत सुत्तेन सूत्रस्याविच्छेदाय ",—572.
" आसोमं वदन्ति etc." (TS. vi 1. 11. 6),—318—9.
आस्कन्दपालिशायस् (?),—820.

"आस्ये इन्द्राबृहस्पती etc",—862.
"आहवनीयादुल्मुकेन पशुं पर्यग्निकरोति",—13.
"आहिताग्निमग्निभिर्दहन्ति यज्ञपात्रैश्च" (See Vol i),—759
"आ हिमवत आ च कुमारीभ्य (from Himâlaya to Cape Comorin),—230, 256, 326, 328.
"आहुतिभिरेव हुतादो देवान्प्रीणाति" (हुताद्=offering-eating),—139.
"आहोपुरुषिक,—802.
"इडानिगद,—172.
"इडान्ता आतिथ्या सन्तिष्ठते etc",—601-2, 783
"इडामुपह्वयति" (TS. ii. 6 7 3),—600.
"इडेरन्ते हव्ये etc", (O Idā, blithesome, adorable etc; VS viii. 43),—Eggeling on Śatap. iv. 5 8 10; 414.
"इडोपहूता"—172.
"इदं धामास्ये हविः प्रियं etc",—862. Āpast. Śr. xvi. 26 3
"इदं विष्णुर्विचक्रमे etc",—653, 869.
"इदं स्तनं मधुमन्तं धयायाम् etc,",—751
"इदं दधि घृतं शाकः etc,",—339, 377, 395.
"इदं ब्रह्मण इदं होतुः etc,"—347.
"इन्द्रं स्तुहि वज्रिणम् etc," (TB ii. 8. 4. 1),—349 Śatap. iii. 3. 4 18.
"इन्द्रा गच्छ हरि च आगच्छ etc,"—175
"इन्द्राय वज्रिणे वृषभमालभेत",—319.
"इन्द्रो दिव इन्द्र ईशे पृथिव्याम् etc,"—139, 145 (RV. x 89. 10).
"इन्द्रो वृत्राणि जिघ्नते,"—138, 143, (RV viii 17 8)
"इमं यज्ञमवान्वेव यज्ञपतिं वर्धन्",—474.
"इमं स्तोममर्हते जातवेदसे etc" (RV. i 94 1),—455
"इमे चिदिन्द्र रोदसी etc," (RV iii. 30. 5),—138, 143
"इयं वा अदितिः etc,"—125

"इयं गौस्तया त्वं क्रीणामि etc,"—178 (Mānava Śr. Sūtra, so Bloomfield)

"इरापद (See Tandya viii 6 9 10),—183, 851

"इरामह यजमाने दधाति",—187.

"इषु, name of a Sacrifice held, like the श्येन, for malevolent purposes (आभिचारिक) and deriving from it (by अतिदेश) some of its accessories,—11. (Āpast. 22 7. 17)

"इषे त्वेति छिनत्ति",—853

"इष्टं हि विदुषां लोके समासव्यासधारणम्" (the 2nd line of a śloka),—71

"इष्टकाभिरग्निं चिनुते",—156 7 (Āpast Śr xvi 21 7)

"इष्टि, an oblation of butter etc, as opposed to a Soma or animal sacrifice,—73

"इष्टिवत् (in Sutra),—764

"ईजाना बहुभिर्यज्ञैः etc (a verse),—837

"ईशानं त्वद्दृशं तस्थुषः',—532 (See RV vii 32 22)

"ईशानमस्य जगतः etc' (RV vii 32 22),—139, 507

"ईशानाय परस्वत आलभेत,"—293 4 (VS xxiv 28)

"ईश्वरं वै रथन्तरमुद्गातुश्चक्षुः etc,"—528.

"उक्थ्या गृह्णाति षोडशिनम्",—498

"उक्थ्यो वैरूपसामा etc (Vol i),—589

"उख्य (See Vol i),—870 874

"उग्राणि ह वा एतानि त्रीणि हवींषि etc",—705

"उच्छ्रयस्व वनस्पते,—858

'उज्जिति (See Vol i, also TS 1 6 4 1, and Sāyaṇa on 1 7. 11 1),—457

"उत्कर (See Index to Jhā),—395

"उत्करे वाजिनमासादयति etc,'—395 (Āpast Śr viii 2 11)

उत्कर्ष (Vol i),—764, 767.

"उत्तम प्रयाज etc,"—314

"उत्तरार्धात्सकृदवद्यति,"—684
उत्तरावत् ('like the milking of the last cows'),—670-1.
"उत्तरेऽहन् द्विरात्रस्य गृह्यते" (cf. Apast., xxii. 14. 14). See Mādhava.
"उदन्तीरोजोधत्ते" (?),—792.
"उदयनीयोऽतिरात्रः",—96, 98.
उदरामये पयः पातव्यम्,—8.
उदवसानीयेष्टि (Vol. i),—355.
"उदु त्यं जातवेदसम् etc" (ṚV.i.50.1),—84 (Āpast. ŚRV. xvi. 26. 1. 3).
"उदुम्बरमुलु खलम् etc,"—679.
"उद्गीथो वा एतर्हि etc,"—221.
"उद्गीयमा इरा वा दात्तासा",—186,
"उद्भिदा यजेत,—677 (Āpast. xxii 11. 19).
उद्वा, to be blown out, extinguished (also उद्वान),—278-9.
उपग,—443.
उपचय, 'addition' (opp of अपo),—106.
"उपनयत मेध्यादुर आशासाना",—180 (Ait. Br. ii.6 i; Āś.—val. 3.3.1).
उपरमन्त्र,—793.
"उपरिष्टात्सोमानां प्राजापत्यैश्चरन्ति",—763.
"उपवर्ती रथन्तरपृष्ठस्य प्रतिपदं कुयात्",—508.
उपवर्णन 'description',—696
उपवाद, 'censure',—629.
"उपवीता वा एतस्याग्नयो भवन्ति",—629.
"उपवेपवत् (vol i),—760.
उपवेपेन कपालान्युपदधाति",—659.
"उपशयो यूपो भवति",—49 Name of the 12th sacrificial post, so Garbe; See Śatap. 3.7.2 1 and TS. 6 6.4.4.
उपसर्जन, any word wh: by composition or derivation loses its original independence while it determines

the sense of another word, secondary, subordinate,—116
उपहूयोऽ निरुक्त etc,'—427
उपांशुयाज (vol 1),—87,89,650
"उपांशुयाजमन्तरा यजति'—650, 654, 656, 658 (TS 2 6 6 4)
उपाख्यत्व (in Sutra),—85
उपोद्घातक,—88
उपोषण, 'fasting',—73
उपास्मै गायता नर "—181
उभयतोदन्त (vol 1),—414
उभयसामा क्रतु,—508, 544
" उभयीर्जुहोत्याग्निकीश्चाध्वरिकीश्च",—401
उपयीर्दक्षिणा ददाति etc "—403
"उभे बृहद्रथन्तरे कुर्यात्',—508 R V I 21 8, Satap 4 4 5 4
"उरुं हि राजा वरुणश्चकार etc",—274
उरुक्रम (विष्णु), 304, 306.
"उरु प्रथस्वेति पुरोडाशं प्रथयति',—836
"उरुप्रथा उरुप्रथस्वोरु ते यज्ञपति प्रथताम् etc,"—836, 335 (VS 1 22, Satap 1 2 2 8
" उरु विष्णो विक्रमस्व,"—275 (AV 7 26 3, TS 1 3 4 1)
उरूक (in Sutra) Its meaning is discussed—273 (Ait B u 7, TB 3 6 6 4)
उरु वै देवाना याज्यानुवाक्य etc ",—862
उषासानक्ता 'night and dawn',—335 (RV 1 122 2, etc)
उस्रा, उस्रिया etc, synonyms of गो (Nighantu 2 11, vol 1 229),—462
" उस्रायै वपायै मेदसोऽनुब्रूहि',—463
" ऊद सस्तुते या पते पर्वणी',—43
" ऊरू या पतौ यजस्व etc",—43
" ऊर्णम्रदसं त्वा स्तृणामि,—787, 821 (VS 11 2 ऊर्णम्रदस = soft as wool See ऊर्णा in *Vedic Index*)

"ऊर्ध्वां वा अन्ये यज्ञ क्रतवः सन्तिष्ठन्ते",—502.
"ऊर्ध्वोऽध्वरः",—392 (VS. ii.8 ; Śatap 1.4.5 3)
"ऊर्ध्वोऽध्वरो दिविस्पृशमह्रुतः etc",—394.
ऊह, 'modification'—in respect of मन्त्र, सामन, or संस्कार when there is a transference from an original to a modified sacrifice, 129, 133.
ऊहग्रन्थ, N. of 3rd hymn book of Sāma Veda,—189.
ऊहतिशब्द is used of a गीति and not of a ऋक्,—29.
"ऊहश्चिरकीर्पितः",—190.
"ऋक्सामेवाच मिथुनीसंभवावेति",—197, 528.
"ऋचा स्तुवते etc",—394
"ऋचि साम गायति",—192 (Śatap. 8 1 3 3 has गीयते)
ऋबीज (vol i),—572, 574, 759
"ऋबीजमप्सु प्रास्यति",—572, 759 (प्रहरति)
"ऋजुमाघारयति etc",—145.
ऋत वै सोमोऽनृतं पशवः etc",—429.
ऋतपेय, N. of an Ekāha,—429, 431
"ऋत्विगाचार्यौ नातिचरितव्यौ" (See अतिचर),—361, 758.
"ऋत्विग्भ्यो दक्षिणां ददाति",—347—8.
"ऋत्विज उपगायन्ति",—78.
"ऋषभं वाजिनं वयं पूर्णमासं यजामहे" (Āpast. 2 20 5),—231.
"एकं सामतृचे क्रियते",—195.
एकत्रिक, N. of an Ekāha sacrifice,—482
"एकधा ब्रह्मणे परिहरति",—344
"एकधाऽस्य त्वचमाच्छ्यतात्",—254 (TB 3 6 6 2. आच्छ्यतात्=छिन्नां कुरुत', Sāyana).
"एकधा प्रतिधापिबत्साकं सरांसि त्रिंशतम्" R V VIII 77.4 Thou Indra at a single drought drank the contents of 30 pails (Griffith),—139.
"एकविंशतिमनुब्रूयात् etc.",—491 (TS 2 5.10 2).
एकविंशेनातिरात्रेण प्रजाकामं याजयेत् etc.,—452, 487—9.

"एकहायनो गौर्दक्षिणा तं सद्भ्याय दद्यात्",—361.
"एकादश प्रयाजानेकादशानुयाजान्" (TS.6.3 7.5 1.6 3.11.6),—74, 385.
"एकादश यूपान् छिनत्ति,"—715.
"एकादश वैतानि पशोरवदानानि",—580.
एकादशसु प्रदीपेषु तैलवर्तिसंपन्नेष्वेकस्मिन् गृहे महान्प्रकाशो भवति etc,—833.
एकादशिनी, a group of 11 yūpas (See Śatap. 3. 7. 2. 1),—49, 68, 7, 5 seems to be parts of a Sacrifice, 261, 312.
"एका दीक्षा तिस्र उपसदः",—834.
"एकादेया etc. (Âpast XIX. 2, 8),—91.
"एका वा अस्योत्तमा स्तोत्रीया etc ",—198.
" एकीयमत,—698 एकाहे उभे बृहद्रथन्तरे कुर्यात् ",
एकेन कृते कर्मणि द्वितीयस्य प्रयोगोऽनर्थकः,—855.
"एको द्वौ बहवोऽपि वा अहीनेन यजेरन् ",—96.
"एतत्खलु साक्षादन्नम् etc.',—294.
"एतद्ब्राह्मण ऐन्द्राग्नः etc,",—14.
"एतयैवान्नाद्य काम याजयेत् ",—773-4
"एतस्यैव रेवतीषु वारवन्तीयमग्निष्टोमसाम कृत्वा ",—645, 735
"एते असृग्रमिन्दवः etc" RV IX 62 1), 'there [Soma] drops have been poured etc',—245
"एतेन राजपुरोहितौ सायुज्यकामौ यजेयाताम् ",—356.
"एते वदन्ति शशतत् etc." (RV X 94 2),—143
"एतेषां राष्ट्रभृतो जुहोति etc" (cf Pāraskara Gṛhya 1.5 7.)
"एवमेव प्रसङ्ग स्यात् etc',—661, 797
एष दण्ड इष्टकाकूटे तिष्ठति महत्तानेन,—312
"एष वै कुणपमत्ति यः सत्रे प्रतिगृह्णाति',—559
"एष वै दशमस्याह्नो विसर्गं ",—553.
"एष वै दर्शपूर्णमासयोरवभृथ ',—37—8.
"एष वै प्रजापति मतन्द्राः etc ",—620.

" एषा वै प्रतिष्ठिता बृहती etc. ",—205.
" एषोऽसि ",—860—1.
ऐककर्म्य,—664, 667.
" ऐकादशिनान्प्रायणीयोदयनीययोरतिरात्रयोरालभेत ",—535,537.
" ऐकादशिन्यामन्वहमेकैकमालभेत ",—537.
" ऐन्द्र एकादशकपालं निर्वपेत्प्रजाकामः " (cf. TS. 2. 2.1.1.),—
612.
" ऐन्द्रवायवं गृह्णाति etc. ",—578.
" ऐन्द्रवायवस्यैन्द्रवायवाग्रान् ग्रहान् गृह्णीयात् ",—511 (cf. TS.
7. 2. 7. 1.)
" ऐन्द्रवायवस्य वा एतदायतनं यच्चतुर्थमहः ",—579.
" ऐन्द्रवायवाग्रं प्रथममहः etc. ",—521.
" ऐन्द्रवायवाग्रौ प्रायणीयोदयनीयौ etc ",—(Apast. xxi. 14
1. 3),—517, 519, 520, 524.
" ऐन्द्राग्नमेकादशकपालं इन्द्राय वृत्रघ्ने etc. ",—16.
" ऐन्द्राग्नमेकादशकपालं निर्वपेत् प्रजाकामः " (TS. 2. 2. 1.
1),—73, 234, 674.
" ऐन्द्राग्नमेकादशकपालं निर्वपेद्यस्य सजाता वीयुः ",—61
" ऐन्द्राग्नो द्वादशपालो मारुत्यामिक्षा " (cf. TS 1. 8 3),—16,
74.
" ऐन्द्यामवभृथ साम गायति ",—219.
" ऐरं कृत्वोद्गेयम् " (Tāndya 8. 6. 10),—183.
ऐरवत,—272, 850.
ऐष्टिक, relating to an इष्टि,—71.
ऐष्टिक पाशुकसौमिकदार्विहोमिकानि,—741.
" ओदनानुद्धरति ",—690.
" ओषधिष्वेव पशून्प्रतिष्ठापयति ",—477
औक्थिक्य, a गानशास्त्र belonging to the Aukthikas,
singers of the Ukthas,—22.
औत्पत्तिक, ' eternal ',—22, 32, 110, 378, 412.
" औदुम्बरः सोमचमसो दक्षिणा ",—129, 431.

" औदुम्बरीं स्पृष्ट्वा etc. ",—194.
औदुम्बरीसमानं शुक्रान्वारंभणम्,—362.
" औदुम्बरो यूपो भवति ",—75, 470—1, 614.
औपासन, the fire used for domestic worship,—324.
" कई स्तवत् etc. ",—(RV. vi. 47. 15),—393.
क उ नु ते महिमनः etc. (RV. x. 54. 3),—394.
ककुभ्, a bullock's hump,—582.
" ककुभो राजपुत्रः प्राश्नाति ध्रुवगोपः ",—(Apast. xxiii. 7. 9 has ककुदो),—582.
" कंकचितं चिन्वीत शीर्षचितं चिन्वीत ",—639.
कंकटकाय दर्भं, नापिताय दधम् (दधशब्दो भागधेयवचनः Sabara),—642.
" कण्वरथन्तरं पृष्ठं भवति ",—227, 469.
कलापवत् (in Sūtra), 320—1.
कपिञ्जलन्याय,—60, 685.
कम्बल,—12, 13.
" कयानश्चित्र आभुवो वा ",—21, 189 (RV. iv. 31. 1; SV. i. 169, ii 32).
करणमन्त्र (See vol. i),—855—6.
कर्मकर, earns a padika daily as wages (See Mahabhāṣya 1. 3. 72),—413.
कर्मफलयोः सम्बन्धे कर्म गुणतः फलं प्रधानतः,—53.
" कलया ते क्रीणामि ",—733. Also on pp. 189, 190, 219.
" कवतीषु रथन्तरं गायति ",—19—21, 30 (See Sāyaṇa on Tandya vii. 8. 3, in which the word कवतीषु occurs and is explained by कशब्दोपेतासु, *Ka* being Prajāpati).
कशावाहिनो रथाः (where Sabara gives मेदस् as equivalent of कश ?),—275.
कश्चिदुच्यते अनुयाकत्रिः पठ्यतामिति, दण्डकलितवदसौ पठ्यते,—522.
"कषायमपघ्नन्ति etc.",—680.

"कस्त्वा युनक्ति etc.", —828
"कस्मै देवाय हविषा विधेम",—393 (R.V.X.121.1 ; TS.iv 1.
8.4 etc.)
कांस्यभोजिव्रत,—840.
कांजिका, sour gruel,—95.
काण्डवीणा, a kind of lute,—445 (Lāṭyāyana iv.2.5)
कात्यायन (compared with Pāṇini), —623.
कामशास्त्र (in sūtra),—512.
कामुकायन, N. of an āchārya,—195, 697.
कामेष्टि (in Sūtra),—360.
"काय एककपालः",—16, 45 (काय=devoted to Ka—Prajā-
pati, Śatap. 2.5.2.13).
कालाभीज्या,—(See यदभीज्या),—230.
"कालेभ्यो भवति मासो देवता संवत्सरो देवता",—(Smriti),—454.
"काशिकेषु शालयो भुज्यन्ते गावः पीयन्ते" (गावः=milk.
M. W.),—171.
काष्ठपूलक, a bundle of wood,—156.
काष्ठवाह, 'a wood carrier' (?),—349, 416.
काष्ठान्याहर्तुं प्रस्थिते पुरुषे शाकाहरणमप्युपाधिः क्रियेत etc.",—867.
कुण्डपायिनामयन, 31, 98-9, 155 (Āpast. Śr. XXIII.
10.6. See कौण्ड०). See Kuṇḍapāyin in *Vedic Index*.
"कुण्डपायिनामयनेऽत्सरुकैश्चमसैः सोमान्भक्षयन्ति",—352.
(Tāṇḍya XXV.4.4. See अत्सरुकैः)
"कुमाराश्च न पयो लभेरन्",—691.
कुम्भीवध,—(in Sūtra),—786.
कूट,—'homeless'.
कृतारंभणीयाक, 'that has performed the *ārambhaṇīyā iṣṭi*,'
—166.
कृत्याचिन्ता,—180,181,182,365,370,432,599,600,751,827,
839,857.

कपिवत् (in Sūtra),—675.

"कपिषु स्याम कुप:", described as कण्डूयनार्थो मन्त्रः,—791.

कृष्णलाः, grains of gold (to be used instead of rice-grains on certain occasions; See Jhā's *Prābh. Mi* p. 231),—301—2.

कृष्णल होम (See 'प्रयाजे प्रयाजे'),—7.

"कृष्णविषाणया कण्डूयति",—748 (TS.vi 1 3.8)

"कृष्णविषाणया वासांसि विस्रंसयति" (cf Āpast. Śr. XVII.16.9),—447.

"कृष्णशीर्वा आग्नेयः",—75.

"कृष्णाजिनेन वित्रस्य दक्षिणां ददाति" (cf. Āpast. Śr. 13.5. 11, and see तुथोवो *infra*),—416

कोप, 'contradiction', 'stultification' (See Brahmasūtra 2.1.26),—411.

कौण्डपायिनामयन,—58,70,90,807 (See कुण्ड॰).

"कौत्सं भवति काण्वं भवति etc",—448—9, 450.

क्रतुवत् (in Sūtra),—666.

क्षीरेण भुक्त्वा क्षीरेणैव भुञ्जीत,—645.

खलि, sediment of oil, oil-cap (M.W. on authority of a कोश),—333.

खले कपोतवद्युगपत्सन्निपतन्त्यङ्गानि,—674

खले वाली,—a post on a threshing floor for binding oxen etc,—311, 314, 383.

"खलेवाली यूपो भवति,"—311, 381, 836 (Tāndya xxi. 13 8).

"खादिरं वीर्यकामाय यूपं कुर्यात्",—81—2.

"खादिरे वध्नाति etc.,"—742.

"खादिरो यूपो भवति",—609.

गणाय स्नानं गणायानुलेपनम्,—664.

गतश्री,—'who has obtained fortune or prosperity',—(=प्राप्तश्री, so com. on Kāty. Śr. IV. 300),—280, 875.

" गन्धर्वाप्सरसो वा एतमनुमादयन्ति"—(TS. 3. 4. 8. 4),—10.
गर्ग त्रिरात्र (Āpast. Śr. 22. 15. 1),—48.
गवामयन (See Vol i),—34, 45, 63, 78, 520, 521—2.
गवेधुक यवागू,—'rice-gruel boiled with coix barbata (MW),—625—6.
" गात्रं गात्रमस्या नूनं कृणुतात् "—277, (TB. 3. 6. 6. 3).
" गायत्रमेतदहर्भवति ",—106.
" गायत्रं प्रथममहः etc. ",—486.
" गायत्रो मध्यमः परिधिः etc. ",—525.
" गायत्र्या परिदध्यात् ",—112.
" गावो वा एतत्सत्रमासत ",—178.
गीति, defined,—212.
गुणकामाः—'accessories and desires',—81.
गुणेदन्ता विकार,—426.
" गुदेनोपयजति प्राणो वै गुदः",—864.
" गृहपतिर्गृहपतिः etc " (Āpast. 23—10. 12),—99.
गृहपतिवत्,—(in Sūtra),—563.
" गृहपति सप्तदशाः स्वयमृत्विजो ब्राह्मणाः सत्रमुपेयुः" (with the गृहपति as the 17th),—76,99.
गृहमेधीय, —599, 609.
गो,—six synonyms quoted, उस्रा etc.,—462.
" गोदोहनेन प्रणयेत्पशुकामस्य " (Āpast Śr. 1. 16. 3),—81.
गोधेनु 'a cow' (MW. gives this word on lexical authority only. See धेनु infra),—58.
" गोमिनाभ्यां क्रोशति ",—863.
गौग्गुलव 'made of bdellium' (an unguent),—445—6.
" गौग्गुलवेन प्रातःसवने समंजते "—(Tāndya xxiv.13-4),—445.
" गौरनुयन्त्योऽजोऽर्सपोमीयः",—462.
" गौरिवीत मन्यदं भवति " 64 (See Apast. xiv. 18. 6. etc).
" गौतं पदा मरुत्यः",—3.
गौग्गुलव, ' made of bdellium,'—801 (See गौग्गुलव)—

"गोश्चाश्वश्च, तस्य द्वादशशतं दक्षिणा"—347, 353—4,407, 417—8, 419
"ग्रहं वा गृहीत्वा चमसं वोन्नीय etc",—223,502.
"ग्रह समाप्ति',—440
"ग्रामकाम सयाजयेत्",—363
'ग्रामकामाय प्रतिपद् कुर्यात्','—81
ग्रामेणोदपान स्वेय etc,—664
ग्राहक, 'partaker', 'sharer',—40—1, 45
घनीभावयितुम्, घनीभूत,—95 (TS 6 2 2 4)
"घृतं वै देवा वज्रं कृत्वा सोममघ्नन् etc',—72
घृतव्रतौ भवत,—761 (TS 6 2 10 5)
"घृतेन द्यावापृथिवी आपृण etc',—121 637 (आपृणेथाम्)
"घृते श्रपयति",—88, 302, 337
"चक्षुषी वा एते यज्ञस्य यदाज्यभागौ"—(TS 2 6 2 1),—391
"चतुरवत्तं जुहोति',—639, 642
"चतुरहे सुत्यामागच्छ मघवन्',—782
"चतुरो मुष्टी निर्वपति"—376, 789
"चतुर्थे चतुर्थेऽहन्यहीनस्य गृह्यते",—(cf Apast xxii 14 15),—504
"चतुर्दश पौर्णमास्यामाहुतयो हूयन्ते',—650, 655, 674, 681, 695 708
"चतुर्भिरादत्ते etc"—855—6 cf Āpast Sr xviii 1 1
"चतुर्विंशति परमा सत्रमासीरन्',—566
"चतुर्होत्रा पौर्णमासीमभिमृशेत् etc',—(cf Āpast Sr ii 11 5),—82, 146
"चतुस्त्रिंशद्वाजिनो देवबन्धो etc',—271 (RV 1 162 18, TS 2 3 2 2)
"चत्वारि चत्वारि कृष्णलान्यवद्यति',—328, 338, 341
"चत्वारि त्रिवृन्ति अहानि etc",—101 (Apast xxii 23 9)
"चत्वारि वा एतानि देवद्यानि अवदानानि etc', 641 (See देवद्ये)

"चत्वारोऽभिस्रवाः etc.",—550.
चरु, various meanings proposed, the one adopted being ओदन, for which see note at bottom of p. 328,—325—30.
चातुर्मास्य (See vol. i and Āpast. Śr. viii. 4. 12, xxii. 8. 1),—14.
" चातुर्मास्यानां यज्ञ ऋतूनां पंचर्त्विजः ",—723.
" चातुर्मास्यानि चातुर्मास्यैः स्वर्गकामो यजेत ",—385.
" चातुर्मास्ये प्राचीन प्रवणे वैश्वदेवेन यजेत ",—(Apast. viii. 1. 5),—701.
" चातुर्मास्यैः स्वर्गकामो यजेत,—473, 708, 720.
" चात्वाले कृष्णविषाणां प्रास्यति " (See vol. i),—736. (TS. 2. 4. 6. 1)
" चित्रया यजेत पशुकामः ",—235
चित्रा, N. of an इष्टि,—89, 381.
" छन्दांसि वा अन्योन्यस्य लोकमभिध्यायन्ति etc.",—524.
" छन्दोगा बह्वृचाश्चैव etc.",—(a verse defining भाषिक स्वर),—850.
" छागस्य वपाया मेदसोऽनुब्रूहि ", – 462—3.
छान्दसाः, students of a Veda,—189. (They hold that a Sāman is a mantra set to music—प्रगीतं मन्त्रवाक्यं साम).
"जगतीं वै छन्दांसि प्रत्यवरोहन्ति, etc,"—522.
जगत्सामन्,—(See vol i) It is declared that in the whole Sāmaveda there in no Sāman named Jagat,—506—7.
"जगृभ्मा ते दक्षिणमिन्द्र हस्तम्",—(RV. X 47.1),—138, 142.
जनक सप्तरात्र,—N. of a Saptāha sacrifice (Apast. Śr. 22. 23.5),—101.
जप,—defined as व्यक्तायां वाचि, with examples,—560—1.
जपसंस्कार,—365.

जयाः,—N. of certain formularies causing victory (TS. iii 4.4 and Pāraskara Grihya I.5.7—9),—21.
जर्तिलयवागू,—'juice of dried Sesamam',—625—6.
"जर्तिलयवाग्वावा जुहुयात्,—etc",—do—(TS.V 4.3.2.)
जलबुद्बुदवत्,—310.
"जघन्याः पत्नीः संयाजयन्ति",—866 (See vol i).
जामि—सादृश्य,—657.
जामितादोष,—489 ("किमिदमविकार इति । अपुनर्वचनं तत्र जामितादोषो न भविष्यति । अभ्यासे हि स स्यात् ",—Sabara).
"जामि वा एतद्यज्ञस्य क्रियते यदन्वञ्चौ पुरोडाशौ, etc,"—654,656, 659 (TS.2.6 6.4, and see vol i).
"जामि वा एतद्यज्ञस्य क्रियते यदेवं भूयः क्रियेत",—489.
जायात्व,—528. (In the same passage on p. 197 the reading is जायार्थे)
"जुषन्तां युज्यं पयः,"—95.
"जुह्वा वा एतर्हि वाग्भवति,—etc.',—435.
"जुह्वावसुरूरसि," (?),—835.
जैमिनि,—(in Sūtra),—103,221,803.
"ज्योतिरेव पुरस्ताद्दधाति",—34.
"तं वै प्रोहेद्वानस्पत्योऽसि"—352.
"ततः संवत्सरे ऽस्थीनि याजयेत् (Āpast XIV.22.12),—362, 369
तत्रभवानामाचारास्तेषां स्मृतेः श्रुतिः,—326.
तद्वादि प्रभवा पशवः स्युः",—68

VII—GLEANINGS FROM THE TANTRAS

BY GOPINATH KAVIRAJ

(I)

The Ten Mahāvidyās.

In the Tantrik Literature the Mahāvidyās are usually enumerated as ten. But the number is sometimes increased by three and sometimes by six*. The Muṇḍamālā Tantra (Paṭala I) names the ten Mahāvidyās, thus—(1) Kālī, (2) Tārā, (3) Ṣoḍaśī, (4) Bhuvaneśvarī, (5) Bhairavī, (6) Chhinnamastā, (7) Dhūmāvatī, (8) Vagalā, (9) Mātaṅgī and (10) Kamalā. This list is also found in the Chāmuṇḍā Tantra as well as in the Toḍala Tantra. There appear to be slight differences of opinion in the various Tantras in regard to the names of the Bhairavas of these Mahāvidyās. These names, as given in the Toḍala Tantra, are—(1) Mahākāla, (2) Akṣobhya, (3) Śiva (three-eyed and five-faced), (4) Tryambaka, (5) Dakṣiṇāmūrti (five-faced), (6) Kavandha (Śiva), (7) none, (8) Ekavaktra (=Mahārudra), (9) Mataṅga Śiva (=Dakṣiṇāmūrti) and (10) Viṣṇu (=Sadāśiva). It may be noted that Dhumāvati being a widow has no Bhairava † and the first Bhairava, named Mahākāla, is attached to Dakṣiṇā, a type of Kālī. But in the Śaktisaṅgama Tantra the names of the Bhairavas under (3), (4), (5), (6), (7) and (8) appear respectively as—Laliteś-vara (=Tripura Bhairava), Mahādeva, Vaṭuka, Vikarāla (=Krodha Bhairava), Kāla Bhairava, (=Ghora) and Mṛtyuñjaya.

---

* The list of the Muṇḍamālā Tantra being taken as standard, the three and six additional names which occur in the Sammohana Tantra are—(i) Chaṇḍeśvarī, Laghu Śyāmā and Tripurā, and (ii) Vanadurgā, Śūlinī, Aśvārūḍhā, Trailokyavijayā, Vārāhī and Annapūrṇā.

† This is according to Toḍala Tantra, but the Śākta Saṅgama names the Bhairava as Kāla.

The Vidyās may be thus classified in order of the Āmnāya :

(1) *The Eastern Āmnāya* :

(i) Śrī Vidyā (with all its varieties), Bhuvaneśvarī, Tārā, Tripurā Bhairavī. (ii) Bhuvaneśvarī, Lalitā, Aparājitā, Pūrṇeśī, Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, Vāṇī, Annapūrṇā, Jayā.

(2) *The Southern Āmnāya* :

(i) Vagalāmukhī, Mahālakṣmī and Bālā Bhairavī. (ii) Dakṣiṇākālī, Bhadrakālī. (iii) Dakṣiṇākālī, Vagalā, Chhinnā, Bhadrā, Tārā, Mātaṅgī and Niśeśī.

(3) *The Western Āmnāya* :

(i) Kubjikā, Kulālikā, Mātaṅgī and Amṛtā Lakṣmī.

(4) *The Northern Āmnāya* :

(i) Kālī and Tārā with some varieties, Bhairavī, Chhinnamastā, Dhumāvatī and Mātaṅgī. (ii) Guhyakālī, Dhūmrā, Kāmakalā Kālī, Mahākālī, Mahā Śmaśāna Kālī, Kapālinī, Kāla Saṅkarṣiṇī, Chhinnā, Mahābhīma Sarasvatī, Mahārātrī, three kinds of Tārā, Yogeśī, Siddhi Lakṣmī and Siddhi Bhairavī.

(5) *The Upper Āmnāya* :

(i) Kāmeśvarī, Lalitā, Bālā, Mahā Tripurasundarī and Tripurā Bhairavī.

(6) *The Lower* (अधर) *Āmnāya* :

(i) Vajrayoginī, Panhagī, Nairṛteśvarī and Bhīmā.

(a) Kālī

Regarding the origin of Kālī, which is described in the Tantras (cf Puraścharyārṇava) as the chief of all the Mahāvidyās, different accounts are available. According to the Svatantra Tantra, quoted in the Prāṇatoṣinī, she appeared in the city of Avantī on the day of Mahārātri, i.e. on the dark eleventh of the month of Phālguna. She is often identified with Satī, the daughter of Dakṣa and

with Pārvatī, the daughter of Menakā. Viśvamitra's tatainment of Brahmanhood is said to be consequent on Her Grace.* The Muṇḍamālā Tantra identifies Kālī with Kṛṣṇa and Sodaśī. It is not proper to enter here into a detailed study of the very close relation existing, from the cultural view-point, between Kṛṣṇa and Ṣoḍaśī. What concerns us here is that the Vidyas Kālī and Ṣodaśī too are similarly connected. The Prāṇatoṣinī (p 724) gives a vision of the story of Kālī's conversion into Sundarī or Ṣodaśī. It is said that once on a certain day Indra deputed a certain number of Apsarasas to Siva in Kailāsa but he sent them on to Kalī in Kālīpura and betook himself to that place. He addressed the Goddess as "Kalī" (lit. a dark-complexioned one), which she took as an insult. She at once resolved to convert herself into "Gaurī" (lit. a fair complexioned one) and vanished. In the meantime Nārada met Śiva in Kālīpura and Mahākālī in Uttara Meru. He told her, of course in joke, that Śiva was ready to marry again, on which She assumed at once an extraordinarily beautiful form and appeared before Śiva. She said, in Śiva's presence, that a very fair form was reflected in His heart. Taking this form

*The story runs that Brahma, Viṣṇu and others being unable to confer Brahmanhood on Viśvamitra, Narada advised the latter to invoke Mahādeva. Viśvamitra acted accordingly and received the one-syllabled Mantra of Kali from Śiva, but for all his hard penances he could not propitiate the Goddess. Viśvāmitra felt disconcerted and cursed the Goddess to be deprived of all worship. Śiva explained to the saint that his mode of worship was improper and that he should correct it in the way he suggested. This being done, the Goddess was pleased and appeared in company of Siva to Viśvamitra who asked for the boon, viz attainment of the glory of a Brahmana. Kāli looked at Śiva, who embraced the saint and conferred on him what he was so long striving for.

to be that of a Goddess on whom Śiva's heart was set she felt the pangs of jealousy and rebuked the God for what she interpreted as his unfaithfulness Śiva asked Her to restrain Herself and, with the Third Eye of Wisdom, to discover the reality of what the form represented. Kālī found to Her great surprise that it was Her own shadow. Śiva then called the beautiful form before Him by the names of Sundarī, Śrī and Pañchamī—which are the synonyms Tripurasundarī or Lalitā He called Her Ṣoḍaśī on account of Her perpetual fresh youth As he was frightened by the Shadow in His heart He gave it the name of Tripurā Bhairavī

There are several varieties of this Goddess In the Puraścharyārnava we find mention of nine types,—viz Dakṣinā, Bhadrā, Smaśāna "Kāla", Guhyā, Kāmakalā, Dhanā, "Siddhi" and Chaṇḍī The Jayadratha Yāmala refers to Ḍambara Kālī, Gahaneśvarī, Ekatārā, Chandaśābarī, Vajravatī, Rakṣākalī, Indīvarī Kālī, Dhanadā, Ramanyā, Īśānakālī and Mantramātā The Sammohana Tantra speaks of ten varieties, but actually mentions seven,—viz Sparśamanī, Chintamanī, Siddhakālī, Vidyārajñī, Kāmakalā, Hamsa Kālī and Guhya Kālī

Of all these varieties Dakṣinā and Bhadra Kālī belong to the Southern Āmnāya, while Guhyakalī, Kāmakalā, Mahākālī and Mahāśmaśāna Kālī belong to the Northern Āmnāya

Guhyakālī, generally worshipped in Nepal, is often described as the best of all the types, and it was of this Goddess that Brahmā, Vasiṣṭha, Rāma, Kuvera, Yama, Bharata, Rāvana, Bali, Indra and others were the worshippers The number of her faces is said to vary with various Sādhakas The type which Bharata worshipped has ten faces and Her mantra consists of 16 syllables The external features of the type of which Rāmachandra was a votary are exactly the same, but Her mantra contains 17 syllables rather

than 16 Hārita and Chyavana both worshipped this 17-syllabled Vidyā, but Hārita obstructed it with a *Kila*, so that until this is removed, which is practically a very difficult matter, it can not reveal itself and become effective The Chyavana type is still in use

The Mahākāla Samhitā explicitly says that the ten-faced type of Guhyakali* is the fundamental type (प्रकृतिः), of which the other varieties are modifications There are seven varieties of Guhya Kālī and five of Dakṣiṇā Kalī

The worshippers of Kāmakala Kālī are named in the Mahā Kala Samhita, thus—Indra, Varuna, Kuvera, Brahmā, Maha Kāla, Rama, Ravana, Yama, Vivasvan, Chandra, Viṣṇu and the Ṛṣis The 18 syllabled type of this Vidyā is supposed to be the best

(b) Tārā

Tārā is the second Mahavidyā in the list She is variously named—as Nila Sarasvatī,* Ugratāra, Ekajaṭā* Mahātārā, Vidyarājñī,† Vāgīśvarī‡, Sarasvatī§

* This is the Sakala form of the Goddess which has three distinct aspects, viz gentle (सौम्या), rough (उग्रा) and extremely fierce (महाक्रूरा) The Niṣkala form is unique

* Tārā, with the initial and final syllables removed, is Nila Sarasvati (Mantra M, fol 28) Ekajaṭā also is a little different from Tārā so far as the Mantra is concerned Its Mantra is either 5-syllabled (e g in the case of Nārāyaṇa's Mantra) or 22 syllabled, in which case the Ṛṣi is Patañjali The expulsion of Divodāsa from Benares is said to have been effected by the power of Tārā Mantra.

† Its Mantra is 32 syllabled (Mantra M fol 39) This is generally known as Mahāvidyā Mantra Mahā, fol 520

‡ The Mantra is 2 syllabled The Goddess is described as white-complexioned and ten armed (Mantra Mahā, fol 527)

§ Sarasvatī is not exactly identical with Vāgīśvarī in form or

according to the Āmnāya to which each is affiliated Thus Sparśatārī, Chandravarnā, Chaṇḍaghaṇṭā, Ghaṇṭikā and Trailokyavijayā belong to the East, Chintāmani, Siddhajaṭā, Trijaṭā, Krūramālikā, Krūrachaṇḍā, Mahāchaṇḍā, Vajratārā, Brahmatārā, Manitāra, Nārasimhī, Chaturvedodari belong to the South; Ugratārā and the 84 types of Hamsatārā to the West; Aṣṭatārā to the North, Mahogratārā, Mahānīlā, Śāmbhavatārā, Mahānīlā Sarasvatī, Chīnasundarī, Nīlasundarī and Mahānīla Sundarī to the Upper Āmnāya

The connection of Tārā with Buddhism is very often referred to in the Tantras. The Rudra Yāmala (Paṭla XVII) and the Brahma Yāmala (Paṭalas I and II) contain a short account of the story of Buddha and Vasiṣṭha with reference to the worship of Tārā It is said in the former work that Vasiṣṭha practised hard penances (in the Nīlachala hills,* says the Brahma Yamala) for a long time for a vision of Tārā, but the Goddess did not appear Feeling depressed he went to his Father, Brahmā, and told him the whole story, asking him at the some time to give him a fresh Mantra He was even inclined to utter a curse Brahmā dissuaded him from cursing and requested him to continue to worship the same Goddess by means of Yoga (योगमार्गेण) Thereupon Vasiṣṭha went to the shore of the Sea† and practised austerities for 1000 years But the Goddess was not propitiated Vasiṣṭha lost all sense of restraint and pronounced a curse upon her On this She appeared and said that his curse was unprovoked, for he was not aware of the mysteries of her worship which are known to

---

* I e in Kamakhya (in Assam)

† Or to the Kāmākhyā thills in Assam, according to Brahma-yāmala

The Tantrachuḍāmaṇi and Tārārṇava describe it as Kuchchhukā and call it a secret Vidyā In the Tārārahasyavṛtti of Śaṅkarāchārya mention is found of several kinds of Tārā, thus · Tārā, Ugrā, Mahogrā, Vajrakālī, Sarasvatī, Kameśvarī and Bhadrakālī, In the Tarābhaktisudhārṇava (11th taranga) of Nṛisimha Ṭhakkura Vajrakālī and Sarasvatī are read as Vajrā and Nīla Sarasvatī.

According to tradition, the different Mantras of this Goddess were worshipped by different persons for different purposes Thus for instance the Mantras which Brahmā had resorted to while conferring boons on Tārakāsura and Hiraṇyakaśipu were 12 syllabled and 7 syllabled respectively Rāma's Mantra was 7-syllabled There is a 7-syllabled Mantra of the Goddess associated with the name of Brahmā, but it is somewhat different Similar is the case with the Mantra of Balarāma Nārāyana, for subjugating the Daityas, worshipped the 5 syllabled form of the Mantra Viṣṇu, in the form of Buddha, is said to have worshipped the 12-syllabled Mantra *for preaching of Buddhism* The Mantra which Mahādeo gave to Paraśurāma for bringing to an end the Kṣattriyas in the land was the 5 syllabled Mantra of Tārā

The different forms of Tārā, of which the exact number cannot be determined, are arranged in some Tantras

---

mantra There are several Mantras of Sarasvatī—viz (i) 10-syllabled, of which the Ṛṣi, Chhandas and Devatā are Kaṇva, Virāṭ and Vāgīśvarī, (ii) 11-syllabled, (iii) 38-syllabled (worshipped by the Jains), (iv) 1 syllabled (Mantra Mahā, fol 531) The form of the Goddess corresponding to the Mantra (i) is white-complexioned, standing on a white lotus (*Do fol 529*); the Goddess of (ii) is described as white-complexioned and either riding on a swan or holding a Japamālā and a pair of lotuses in hands (Do fols. 530-531)

according to the Āmnāya to which each is affiliated Thus Sparśatārā, Chandravarnā, Chandaghantā, Ghantikā and Trailokyavijayā belong to the East, Chintāmani, Siddhajaṭā, Trijaṭā, Krūramālikā, Krūrachaṇḍā, Mahāchaṇḍā, Vajratārā, Brahmatārā, Manitārā, Nārasimhī, Chaturvedodarī belong to the South; Ugratārā and the 84 types of Hamsatārā to the West; Aṣṭatārā to the North, Mahogratārā, Mahānilā, Śāmbhavatārā, Mahānilā Sarasvatī, Chīnasundarī, Nīlasundarī and Mahānīla Sundarī to the Upper Āmnāya

The connection of Tārā with Buddhism is very often referred to in the Tantras The Rudra Yamala (Paaṭla XVII) and the Brahma Yamala (Paṭalas I and II) contain a short account of the story of Buddha and Vasistha with reference to the worship of Tārā It is said in the former work that Vasiṣṭha practised hard penances (in the Nīlachala hills,* says the Brahma Yāmala) for a long time for a vision of Tārā, but the Goddess did not appear Feeling depressed he went to his Father, Brahmā, and told him the whole story, asking him at the some time to give him a fresh Mantra He was even inclined to utter a curse Brahmā dissuaded him from cursing and requested him to continue to worship the same Goddess by means of Yoga (योगमार्गेण) Thereupon Vasiṣṭha went to the shore of the Sea† and practised austerities for 1000 years But the Goddess was not propitiated Vasiṣṭha lost all sense of restraint and pronounced a curse upon her On this She appeared and said that his curse was unprovoked, for he was not aware of the mysteries of her worship which are known to

---

* I e in Kamakhya (in Assam)

† Or to the Kāmākhya thills in Assam, according to Brahma-yāmala

Buddha alone in the country of Mahāchina. These are generally included in the so-called Chīnāchāra‡.

Vasiṣṭha repaired to Mahāchīna and entreated Buddha to initiate him into the secrets of Tārā worship, but when he found around him the devotees of Tārā indulging in non-vedic rituals and steeped in the excesses involved in the worship by the 5 Ms—*i. e.* Madya, Mānsa, etc.—he felt disgusted and doubts as to the propriety and dignity of this form of worship began to trouble his mind. Buddha realised his plight and explained to him the Kulamārga, which is praised as the noblest path leading to spiritual realisation. Through his persuasion Vasiṣṭha adopted the Śākta worship (of Tārā) by means of wine and the other accessories till he became a perfect Yogī (पूर्णयोगी) and had a vision of the Goddess.

For a long time the Tārā Mantra, owing to the curse of Vasiṣṭha, remained ineffective, but its *Utkīlana* was performed subsequently, so as to remove its barrenness. In some places it is noted that the effect of the curse was till the advent of the Kṛṣṇa Avatāra (cf Puraścharyārṇava, p. 782).

As regards the origin of the Goddess it is related that She came forth from the upper Mouth of Śiva in the form of a bright flame and fell into the Chola (or Cholana) lake to the west of Mount Meru on the day of Kālarātri, i e. on

‡ The Brahmayāmala describes the Chīnāchāra in the following terms.

स्नानादिर्मानसः शौचो मानसः प्रवरो जपः । पूजनं मानसं दिव्यं मानसं तर्पणादिकम् ॥ सर्व एव शुभः कालो नाशुभो विद्यते क्वचित् । न विशेषो दिवारात्रौ न सन्ध्यायां महानिशि ॥ वस्त्रासनस्थानगेहदेहस्पर्शादिवारिणः । शुद्धिं न चाचरेत्तत्र निर्विकल्पं मनश्चरेत् ॥ नात्र शुद्ध्याद्यपेक्षास्ति न चामेध्यादिदूषणम् । सर्वदा पूजयेद्देवीमस्नातः कृतभोजनः ॥ महानिशाशुचौ देशे बलिं मन्त्रेण दापयेत् । स्त्रीद्वेषो नैव कर्तव्यो विशेषात् पूजनं स्त्रियाः ॥

the Dīpāvalī day (14th dark tithi combined with Amā of Kārtika) Rising out of the lake she assumed a blue hue and became known as Nīlasarasvatī The saint Akṣobhya, who is described as an Emanation from Mahādeva and was living on the north of the lake, observed the whole affair and began to worship Her (cf Pranatoṣinī, pp 720 722, Tārābhaktisudhārnava, 1st Taranga)

The connection of Akṣobhya with Tāra is remarkable For it is found in the Buddhist literature as well—and modern scholars are strongly inclined to believe that the whole Tarā legend was really a graft from the Buddhistic source upon Hindu Tantra Śastra Akṣobhya is a very well known name in Mahāyāna Buddhism as that of a Dhyānī Buddha whose colour is blue and whose posture of hand (मुद्रा) is what is known as Bhusparśa The Śakti and Bodhisattva attached to Akṣobhya are Lochana and Vajrapāni respectively

The derivative meaning of the name Akṣobhya (lit 'unperturbable') is given in the Tantras Śiva was called by this name because he was not agitated even after drinking the deadly poison which came out of the Churning of the Ocean (cf Prāṇatoṣinī p 719)

(To be continued)

VIII—THE DATE OF MADHU-SUDANASARA-SVSATI.

By Gopi Nath Kaviraj

The date of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī has been as much a vexed problem in the chronology of Indian Literature as that of Appayya Dikṣita The paper on Appayya Dikṣita*, recently published in the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras (Vol II, pts 3 4, pp 226 237), has indeed thrown much fresh light on the date of Appayya, though certain difficulties still remain to be solved But the date of Madhusūdana seems yet to be an open question Mr R. Krishna Swami Sastri, B A, contributed an interesting paper on the age of Madhusudana in the pages of the same Journal (Vol II, pt 2, pp 97 104), pleading in favour of the third quarter of the 17th Century as his probable date

Assuming that the date of Appayya, as finally determined by Mr Y Mahalinga Sastri, is correct, viz that Appayya was born about 1520 A D and died about 1593, having lived a life of 72 years, it seems to one more than likely that Madhusudana too lived about the end of the 16th Century or a little earlier Madhusūdana s date cannot be dragged down into the 17th Century for the obvious reason that a manuscript of the Siddhantabindu composed by him was transcribed in Saka 1539 (नवाग्निबाणेन्दुमिते शकाब्दे) or 1617 A D This is the most positive proof in support of the 16th Century date for Madhusudana Besides, Narāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa is said to have defeated Madhusūdana and Nṛsimhaśrama in a public controversy Narayana s commentary on the Vṛttaratnakara was written in 1545 A D

* By Y Mahalinga Sastri, B A B L. Mylapore

which is therefore also the date of Madhusūdana This is perfectly in keeping with the date of Nṛsiṃhāśrama whose Vedāntatattvaviveka was composed in 1547 A D Madhusūdana's high praise of Appayya, whom he describes as सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्र is explicable on the supposition that Madhusūdana was a junior contemporary of the latter In the same way Appayya's alleged intellectual conversion by Nṛsiṃha and his respectful reference to the views of the latter in the Siddhāntaleśa saṅgraha are easily intelligible if Nṛsiṃha is held to have been an earlier contemporary of Appayya Nṛsiṃha lived up to an advanced age

That Madhusūdana's Advaitaratnarakṣaṇa was written in reply to Śaṅkara's Bhedaratna is certain But Saṅkara's date is not after 1529 A D, but long before it* A Ms of his Bhedaratna was copied in Sam 1519 or 1462 A D Sankara may be assigned to the 15th Century Madhusūdana's contemporary Nṛsiṃhāśrama too had already commented upon a similar work, called Abhedaratna, written by one Mallanaradhya with the same end in view, i e for vindication of the cause of Advaita

Madhusudana's posteriority to Appayya is undoubted, but this need not imply any long interval between the two authors They can well be explained by the assumption that Madhusudana was a younger contemporary of Appayya As Madhusudana's date can not be brought down beyond 1617 A D, when a Ms of his Siddhantabindu was copied,

* The present writer pointed out long ago Dr Gaṅganatha Jha in his Preface to the Vadivinoda pp 1 2 places Sankara about Samvat 1585 But in view of the positive evidence adduced above it is no longer possible to hold this date as true

(The Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavana Studies Vol III, p 151)

this assumption becomes inevitable And in the light of evidence adduced by Y Mahalinga Sastri it seems no longer possible to stick to the old dates for Appayya Dikṣita*.

Vyāsarāja too was probably an older contemporary of Madhusūdana. The date for him given by Mr R K Śāstrī, i e between 1446 and 1539 A D, may be accepted It is said that Vyāsarāja himself sent his pupil Vyāsāśrama to study Vedānta with Madhusudana†

Rāmatīrtha‡, pupil of Kṛṣṇa Tīrtha¶, commented on

---

* In my paper on "Mimansa MSS in the Government Sanskrit Library (Benares)' *I assumed (vide p 178 of the Princess of* Wales S B Studies, Vol VI) 1587 1658 A D as the probable date of Appayya Dikṣita. But this may now be rejected in favour of the date proposed by Mr Y Mahalinga Sastri Śankara Bhatta I, the second son of Narayana Bhatta, was the author of a criticism on Appayya's Vidhirasayana Śankara's time is about the end of the 16th Century, his father s Commentary on the Vrttaratnakara having been composed in 1545 A D This too shows that Appayya lived in the 16th Century and *not later* This Śankara Bhatta was one of the Gurus of Bhattoji Dikṣita (Indian Antiquary, 1912, p 11) Cf also Bhatta Vamsa Kavya Kanta Bhatta Kamalakara, Śankara s nephew, also quoted from Appayya Dikṣita (S K De s Sanskrit Poetics, Vol I, p 266) It may be pointed out in this connection that *Dr Keith too accepts the 16th Century as the probable age* of Appayya Dikṣita (See "A History of Sanskrit Literature ', Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1928, pp 396 & 481)

† See History of Vedanta Philosophy by Swami Prajnanananda, Vol III, pp 730, 750

‡ *This Rama Tirtha* was also the author of a commentary on Śankara s Upadesa Sahasri

¶ The Guru of Rama Tīrtha was one Krṣna Tirtha, as *mentioned* in Rama s Commentaries *on the Upadesa Śahasri and* Sankṣepa Śariraka There is a Ms of Tattva Chandrika a

age is furnished, not by the date of Hari Dīkṣita's Brahmasutrāvṛtti (completed in 1736 A D) but by that of the transcription of a Ms of Siddhāntabindu (1617 A D) There is no doubt that Nārāyana Tīrtha, the Guru of Brahmānanda, whose commentaries on some of Madhusūdana's works (viz Chandrikā,-Bṛhat and Laghu—on the Advaita Siddhi and Nyāyaratnāvalī on the Siddhāntabindu) are well known, was greatly influenced by Madhusudana's teachings His Bhaktichandrikā bears upon it traces of his close familiarity with Madhusudana's Bhaktirasāyana and he himself wrote a Commentary on the latter's Siddhāntabindu (recently published from Benares) Nārāyana lived about the end of the 18th Century In the Sanskrit College Library Benares there is a Ms of Muktāvaliprakāśa by Dinakara dated Sam 1758 or 1701 A D This Ms belonged *to the private library of Narāyana Tirtha himself*

IX.—DESCRIPTIVE NOTES ON SANSKRIT MANUSCRIPTS

By Gopinath Kaviraj

Introduction

The history of Indian Literature and Culture does not seem to have yet been taken up for study in the manner which the nature of the subject demands The efforts of Max Müller, Weber Macdonell, Keith, Winternitz and others have done much indeed to systematise the researches into the history of the Sanskrit Literature, especially in regard to chronology and bibliography as a whole, and a host of writers have done, and been still doing a good deal of valuable spade work in various fields connected with Sanskrit Studies Descriptive Catalogues of Mss hitherto published, are of great use not only for bibliographical studies but also for literary chronology, which is often a vixed subject But with all these data —and they are by no means insignificant,—it is not possible to attempt to build up the cultural history of the country, unless and until they are reinforced by the data available on a close and systemative study of the contents of the important unpublished manuscripts lying in deposit in the various libraries of India and outside It is indeed true that even all the published Sanskrit works have not yet been ransacked and subjected to a thoroughly critical examination so far as their contents are concerned But such a work may be left to scholars, who will be able to accomplish it, each in his own sphere of study, sooner or later As for the Mss however, the need of such an examination is imminent and even imperative, for the following reasons

(*a*) Mss deposited in libraries are not within easy reach of all scholars interested in the subjects concerned

(*b*) Some of them being fragmentary and unique may never be published at all

(*c*) Even those which are complete are not likely to be published in entirety and at an early date

(*d*) Single leaves are sometimes found to contain valuable information which, unless it is noted, is never likely to be available for study

(*e*) Mss, old and decaying, are in fear of being soon destroyed It is desirable to have a record of the contents, specially on the important points dealt with, of interesting Mss which for some reason or other have a value of their own A critical and comparative study of these notes can easily be attempted subsequently, when a large amount of such matter will have been collected

I think a work of this nature has long been a desideratum and I believe that every Library of Sanskrit manuscripts ought to come forward ready for co operation in this cyclopaedic work and try to contribute its own quota to this end This must be done if a systematic study of Sanskrit literature and the culture reflected therein has ever to be undertaken

Under the name of "Descriptive Notes I propose to bring out the results of my studies of manuscripts, with special reference to their contents These notes keep in view the requirements of cultural and historical study The names of the Mss from which notes have been taken have not been arranged in any order,—such arrangement is evidently impossible at the beginning But it is proposed to append at the end of notes on a certain number of Mss a classified list of the works noticed The Mss belong mostly

o the Government Sanskrit Library, but there are some of private owners also In every case this has been clearly indicated

—— o ——

No 1

श्रीकृष्णयामल महातन्त्र

Fols 3 13 Script—Devanagari

Interlocution between Brahmana and Brahmani A fragment only Ms old, and the script rather peculiar (Plate)

The Codex begins with an interesting tale of the various Avataras *viz* (*a*) Pṛśnigarbha (*b*) Ṛṣabha (*c*) Pṛthu (*d*) Nara Narayana, (*e*) Dhanvantari (*f*) Hayagriva (*g*) Datta son of Atri and Anasūya (*h*) Kapila (*i*) Paraśurama son of Renuka, (*j*) Rama and his brothers (*k*) Vyasa and (*l*) Kṛṣṇa who descends in every Manvantara in the 22nd Dvapara Yuga with His own Śaktis, and Gopas &c who are the products of His own Body

Bṛndavana is said to be of two kinds—(i earthly (भौम) and (ii) transcendent (दिव्य) of which the former again is two-fold one in Mathurā and the other in Puruṣottama (Puri)

यत्र वै भगवान् कृष्णस्तत्र वृन्दावन वनम् ।
तत्रैव राधिका नित्या भद्रा दत्तो च तत्र वै ॥
तत्र वै बलरामस्तु गोपा गोप्या गवा गण ॥

Names of Viṣṇu s Avataras and their various functions for redemption of the world are then stated It is here added in passing that the way of Knowledge was for the first time preached by the four Sanas* and the Way of Devotion by Narada

* i e Sanaka Sanandana Sanātana and Sanatkumara

The Divya Bṛndāvana is above Liṅga and Yoni—*Puruṣa* and Prakṛti, it is here that the Supreme Being abides in the undiminished splendours of His Existence, Self-awareness and Delight He is transcendent and formless (निराकार), while at the same time invested with infinity of forms (साकार)—the Quintessence of Joy, the Lord of the Universe His Śakti is Rādhikā, the Soul of Delight (परमानन्दरूपिणी) From Her come forth and in Her continue the Universe and the innumerable Souls (कोटि नार्यः)* inhabiting it With them Śrikṛṣṇa is reported to be playing always and in myriads of ways He is the limitless Ocean of Joy (रसाम्बुधि) and His plays with His Śaktis, also limitless, give rise in phenomena to the varieties of what we have come to term Aesthetic Joy (रस)

---

* Mentioned here as naris, females once It may be of interest to note that in the Vaiṣṇava Cult, of which Rādhikopaniṣad represents an aspect, the souls are conceived as feminine Śrikṛṣṇa Himself, the Supreme Self, is the Only Puruṣa in this view, and the rest are His Prakṛtis or Śaktis Even in the Gita (VII 4 5) the Jiva is described as the Prakṛti of Īśvara along with Nature (the Avyakta of Sāṅkhya), with this distinction, however, that it is higher (परा) and that the latter is lower (अपरा)

The passage in the Rādhikopaniṣad which refers to Rādhikā (=आनन्द or ह्लादिनीशक्ति of the Deity) as the Immaculate source of Universal manifestation finds its closest parallel in the saying of the Upaniṣad आनन्दादेव खल्विमानि भूतानि जायन्ते, &c. *And it also implies that from the Fullness of Divine Joy* (आनन्द), by an apparent split within Itself, by a process of negation or contraction, चित् (corresponding to संवित्शक्ति) and सत् (corresponding to सन्धिनीशक्ति), the so-called Puruṣa and Prakṛti, have finally evolved (much in the fashion indicated in Sufi philosophy)

The position of Nitya Bṛndavana, according to this school, may be understood from a glance at the following rough sketch

Bṛndavana
|
Brahmajyotis
| |
River Viraja————River Viraja
|
Śivaloka
|
Deviloka
|
Mahaviṣṇuloka

It is related that once Brahma, with a host of other gods, conceived the idea of making a pilgrimage to this Bṛndavana They took for their guide a Person, named Mahahari, an emanation from the mouth of Mahaviṣṇu and started on their journey This Person is represented as blue, eight armed, yellow robed, lotus eyed and wearing a garland of wild flowers They went first to the Plane of Durga or Tripura Sundarī whose Form is described as that of a bright and youthful goddess, with three eyes and four arms bearing the fivefold arrow, a bow, a noose and a hook and decked with red ornaments She appears here as the Type of Supreme Beauty She blessed them all

Thereupon the gods proceeded up to the Plane of Śiva, where they beheld a Luminous Liṅga in touch with the Mahāyoni or Yogapīṭha It pervaded the Universe and yet transcended its utmost bournes It was Sadāśiva The gods recognised Him and sang hymns in His praise, on which the God issued forth from the Liṅga in a form half male and half female called Ardhanārīśvara He described Himself to be the Liṅga or Tejas of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Durgā as Rādhikā Herself It was through the effect

of Māyā *alone that she was of the form of Yoni* * This Plane is the utmost limit of the gunas Beyond is the *Ineffable, Unsullied, the Immutable, the Silent Here* Time and Space, as *limiting conditions*†, are annihilated, and do not find any place

नात्र दिक्कालनियमौ न चैवास्ति गमागमः ।

Śiva blessed them all But the gods were disheartened and were about *to retire, in view of the immensity, unmea*sureability and inaccessibility of the Light Beyond Śiva took pity on the depressed gods, and at that time from His five mouths issued forth the great mantra, called the Pañchapadīvidyā, viz क्लीं कृष्णाय गोविन्दाय गोपीजनवल्लभाय स्वाहा which the gods received and the Initiation took place

The next step was the river Viraja It is described as luminous (ज्योतिर्मयी), shoreless and endowed with innumerable qualities While on its bank they heard coming from Beyond a sweet strain, as of flutes (वेणु), lutes (वीणा) and mrdangas and the sounds of Krsna's names (Govinda, etc) chanted The gods were over joyed and began to meditate fervently (जप) on the great Mantra which they had received Opening their eyes they beheld lying before them a vast City of Light, bright but mellow, and brilliantly decked In the river they saw, around them, the reflection of a forest of Kadambas In this was a Kalpa Tree, with branches of jewels leaves of emerald, trunk of gold, fruits of rubies, roots studded with gems, and shadowy. Under this tree they beheld to their infinite delight and

* Linga and Yoni are two pro-creative symbols and stand for the Divine Father and Mother They stand at the apex of creative flux, and above them both (also permeating and upholding them) is the Eternity

† This is important, for as व्यावहारिक they have their use even in the Eternal Realms (नित्य धाम)

amazement, sitting, a Beautiful Boy, with the crown of peacock's tail on His head, wild garlands round His neck, wearing robes like lightning-flashes and various ornaments and shining with the bluish tint of a newly risen cloud on the horizon. He was playing on the flute and was of a Form whose beauty surpassed in an infinite degree the loveliness and charm of the god of Love. On His lap was a Girl, lightning-like and adorned.

The devas were so much taken with this glorious vision of Rādhā Kṛṣṇa that *they at once set themselves* to swim across, when Mahāhari stopped them, saying :—

> अवगाहनाद्‌ भवेदस्याः पुमान्‌ स्त्री महिला पुमान्‌ ।
> ऊर्द्धं गच्छन्ति ये चास्याः ते वै ज्योतिर्मयाः परे ॥
> निरञ्जने निराधारे निर्मले चापुनर्भवाः ।
> शुद्धे सूक्ष्मे निमज्जन्ति कृष्णे ज्योतिर्मयेऽक्षरे ॥

The river was embanked. The city was decorated all round *with* jewelled-staffs (रत्नध्वज) and flags. The gods. moved on towards it, when lo!

> आत्मानमेकमभितो नानाकारमितस्ततः ।
> पश्यन्ति परमाश्चर्यं ब्रह्मविष्णुमहेश्वराः ॥

The rare and marvellous vision of One Self playing in myriads of forms was *vouchsafed to them.*

A picturesque description of this Realm is then given. It is narrated that the gods, before actually entering into the precincts of this city, were asked by the gate keeper, who was himself in every respect of the same form as Kṛṣṇa, to state from which Brahmāṇḍa they came and for what purpose *and also to establish the identity of each.**

---

* For the worlds being infinite, the Brahmās Viṣṇus etc., who are *only the functionaries concerned with government of the* Universe under the direction of the Supreme, must also be consistently held to be countless. It is immaterial in this context

No 2.

विप्रानन्द तरङ्गिणी OF KASI NATHA

Fols 1—3 Script—Nagari

The work begins—

या विद्येत्यभिधीयते श्रुतिपथे शक्तिः सदाद्या परा
सर्वज्ञा भवबन्धभित्तिनिपुणा सर्वाशये संस्थिता ।
दुर्ज्ञेया सुदुरात्मभिश्च मुनिभिर्ध्यानास्पदं प्रापिता
प्रत्यक्षा भवतीह सा भगवती बुद्धिप्रदा मेऽस्तु वै ॥ १ ॥
नत्वा श्रीदक्षिणामूर्तिचरणाम्भोरुहद्वयम् ।
काशीनाथः प्रतनुते विप्रानन्दतरङ्गिणीम् ॥ २ ॥

The author says that it is declared in the Kalpasutras, attributed *to Bhagavan Nārāyana, that the upāsana of Gāyatrī* alone is sufficient for the Brāhmanas to secure Mokṣa— परब्रह्मपरमकारुणिकेन भगवता नारायणेन कल्पसूत्रे विप्राणां गायत्र्युपासनामात्रेणैव मुक्तिरिति प्रतिपादितम् (fol 1 b) In support of this several quotations are given, some without reference to the source and some from the Āditya Purāṇa, Viṣṇu Yāmala, Atharva Veda Devyātharva Śiras, Gāyatrī hṛdaya, Gāyatrīstavarāja, Gāyatrīrahasya and Vāsiṣṭha

---

whether we are to conceive the gods as Jīvas with extended powers and wisdom or as Īśvara, with His infinite power and wisdom curtailed for division into multiple centres of activity In both hypotheses the worlds and the gods would be innumerable The Primum Materia being given as infinite, the worlds following from it must be supposed to be without an end The plurality of worlds is a rational and legitimate hypothesis and is accepted as a matter of course in every system of Indian Thought Cf Kusumāñjali (II Stavaka), Śivapurāṇa, Schrader, Introduction to the Pāñcharātra p 29 See also Chaitanya Charitāmrita Sarkar s English Translation of the above, pp 273-275. Tattva trava (Benares Ed), p 66

The Gāyatrīhṛdaya presents this scheme of Emanation· Pranava (the mystic syllable 'Om)—Vyāhṛti—Gāyatrī—Sāvitrī—Sarasvatī—Vedas—Brahmā—the Lokas It is stated that all the Vedas with their angas, all the Upanisads, all the Itihasas *have emanated from the Gāyatrī* In the Gāyatrī-rahasya prominence is given to Śakti, as usually in the Tantrik works, and the Śakti is described as two fold, viz *Saguna and Nirguna, the former worshipped by men of the* world (रागिणः) and the latter by the recluse (विरागिण)

The quotations from the "Atharva Veda' (?) consist of Anuṣṭup verses, Paurānic or Tantrik in character, in which *the order of Emanation is given as below*

Chitsakti—*Prakṛti* (= the *Reflected Image* of *Chitśakti*, प्रतिबिम्बस्वरूपिणी)—Mahat—Ahankāra—Ākāśa—Vāyu—Agni—Jala—Prithvi—Oṣadhi—Anna—Retas In this way the entire univese is ultimately traced to Śaktibimba or Nature

No 3

वामाचारमतखण्डनम् OF KAŚĪNĀTHA

Fols 1-10. Script—Nāgarī

The author calls himself *Kāśīnātha Bhaṭṭa Bhaḍa*, son of Śiva Bhaṭṭa *alias* Jayarāma Bhaṭṭa, son of Śivarāma Bhaṭṭa His mother's name appears as Vārānasī in the colophons of his works—(*a*) गायत्रीपुरश्चरणचन्द्रिका and (*b*) चण्डिकार्चनदीपिका, of which extracts are given in Peterson's Ulwar Catalogue (pp 238, 239) In the Introductory verse (no 1) of (*a*) his teacher is named Ananta His other known works are—

(*c*) यन्त्रचन्द्रिका (Ibid, p 252)

(*d*) शिवपूजातरङ्गिणी (Ibid, p 252)

(*e*) चिदानन्दतरङ्गिणी, *described in No 3, passim*, is

probably his work. In (*c*) the author is described as दक्षिणा-चारमतप्रवर्तक ।

The author is very anxious to prove that the views of the Vāmāchārins are unfounded. It is said that in the 64 Tantras and 8 Yāmalas the teacher Dakṣiṇāmūrti prescribed all rites for the first three castes according to Dakṣiṇa mārga and for the Śūdras according to Vāma mārga. The Merutantra says plainly that Vāmāchāra is not intended for the 3 higher castes and again that of the three kinds of Upāsanā mental Pūjā and Japa are Sāttvika, Dakṣiṇa and Image worship are rājasika and offerings to 'Bhaga' etc. are tāmasic. The Samayachāra Tantra divides Āchāra into two classes and explains Vāmāchara as connected with the five mudrās, etc. and Dakṣināchāra as devoid of the same. In the *Uttara Kaulārṇava* there is a description of Vāmāchāra, saying that in this form wine, meat and similar other things are its accessories and that *really* obscene acts have to be indulged in (प्रत्यक्षयोन्याम्). The triangle (त्रिकोण) is a symbol of the female organ. The Digambaras, Kṣapaṇakas etc. are votaries of this form of worship, which is declared to be non-vedic. There are certain minor differences however between the methods of worship of the Kaulas and those of the Digambaras*

---

* अत्र वाम महाचारो दिगम्बरक्षपणादिभिः [illegible] ।
[illegible] etc.

XI.—A NOTE ON THE MEANING OF THE TERM 'PARARDHA'

By Umesa Miśra

I the course of my studies I happened to come across the word '*Pararddha*' representing various stages of numeral notation In the Śukla Yajurveda Samhita,[1] to begin with, we find that it is the *thirteenth* place of notation which Pararddha occupies Thus the order of numerical notations found in this Samhita is as follows —

Eka = 1
Daśa = 10
Śata = 100
Sahasra = 1000
Ayuta = 1000,0
Niyuta = 100,00
Prayuta = 1000 000
Arbuda = 1000 000 0
Nyarbuda = 100,000,00
Samudra = 1000 000 000
Madhya = 1000,000,000,0
Anta[2] = 1000,000 000,00
Pararddha = 1000,000,000,000

Here both Uvata and Mahidhara in their Bhasyas on the above say that we get the subsequent number when the preceding one is multiplied by ten [3]

---

1 Adhyaya 17 Rc. 2 PP 311, Nirnaya Sagar Bombay Ed 1912

2 It is also called Antariksa

3 Sukla Yajurveda Samhita PP 311

But in the explanation of these terms Mahidhara differs and holds that, truly speaking, it is the eighteenth place of notation which is occupied by Parārdha Thus the differences, according to him, begin from Prayuta, which is equal to ten lacs, as Niyuta represents a lac After Prayuta comes Koṭi and then Arbuda and Nyarbuda The latter, he says, is a synonym of *Abja* Further, he says that as Abja literally means that which is produced out of water, it implies that the numerals coming between Abja and Samudra, namely, Kharva, Nikharva, Mahāpadma, and Śaṅku are indicated by Abja only Thus according to him the following is the order —

that the numbers one to Pararddha (as given in the text) are to be had when each preceding one is multiplied by ten * According to the text as explained by Uvata, Mahidhara and later Smrti writers, *Samudra* is equal to 1000 000 000 which now will become 1000,000,000 000 00 Both these explanations cannot be true in any way

Coming to Jyotihśastra we fird that it is the eighteenth place which is occupied by Parardha and the order is almost the same as given by Mahidhara The only difference is that Mahidhara holds that Samudra multiplied by ten becomes one Madhva which, when multiplied by ten, becomes one′ Anta or Antya In the Jyotihśastra here the order is reverse It holds that Samudra multiplied by ten becomes Anta or Antya, which when multiplied by ten becomes Madhya † This seems to be the view of Visnupurana also ‡

But Dhananjaya Bhatta, a commentator on Jyotihśastra, holds a different view According to him it is the thirty second place which Parardha occupies in the order of numeral notations§ Thus the order is as follows —

---

* अत्रैकादिपरार्धपर्यन्ते शब्दैरुत्तरोत्तरं दशगुणिता सख्योच्यते—Mahidhara Bhasya on Ibid

एवमस्याप्रभृति दशसंख्यागुणितं परार्धपर्यन्तं पूर्वोक्तसंख्याविशेषमनुचिन्त वर्धमानसंख्येयनिष्ठं सख्या जातमित्यादि—Ubata Bhasya

† Vide Lilavati of Bhaskaracarya Sankhyaparimanam of Keśava Miśra the great Smrtikara pp 1 2 Darbhang Ed Saka 1825

‡ Quoted by Keśava Miśra

§ Ibid

Eka = 1

Daśa = 10

Śata = 100

Sahasra = 1000

Ayuta = 1000,0

Lakṣa = 1000,00

Daśalakṣa = 1000,000

Koṭi = 1000,000,0

Daca Koṭi = 1000,000,00

Cata Koṭi = 1000,000 000

Arbuda = *1000,000,000 0*

Abja = 1000,000,000,00

Kkarva = 1000,000,000,000

Mahākharva = 1000,000,000,000,0

Padma = 1000,000,000,000,00

Antya = 1000,000,000,000 000

Mahāpadma = 1000,000 000,000 000,0

Mahācā = 1000,000,000,000,000,00

Śaṅkha = 1000,000,000,000,000,000

Mahāśankha = 1000,000 000,000 000 000,0

Kṣiti = 1000,000 000,000,000,000,00

Mahākṣiti = 1000,000 000 000 000 000 ,000

Kṣobha = 1000,000,000,000,000,000 000 0

Mahākṣobha = 1000 000 000,000 000,000,000 00

Nidhi = 1000,000 000,000,000 000,000 000

Mahānidhi = 1000,000,000 000 000,000,000 000,0

Samudra = 1000,000,000,000 000,000,000,000,00

Puṣkara = 1000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000

Acintya 1000 000,000,000 000 000,000 000,000 0

Amita = 1000,000 000 000,000,000,000 000 000,00

Ananta = 1000,000,000,000 000,000 000,000,000,000

Parārdha = 1000,000,000,000 000,000,000,000,000,000,0

Keśava Miśra says that in the Bālabh[illegible]ans, which is

a work on Jyotih śāstra in place of Antya, the sixteenth place, we have Śanku.* This Bālabhusana is attributed to one Chandeśvara.†

Lastly, we find that Agnipurana differs from all the above and holds that it is the sixteenth place which is occupied by Parārdha. Thus it enumerates the notations in the following order —‡

Eka = 1
Daśa = 10
Śata = 100
Sahasra = 1000
Ayuta = 1000,0
Niyuta = 1000,00
Prayuta = 1000,000
Koṭi = 1000,000,0
Arbuda = 1000 000,00
Vṛnda = 1000,000,000
Kharva = 1000,000,000 0
Nikharva = 1000,000 000,00
Śankha = 1000,000,000,000
Padma = 1000,000 000,000,0
Samudra = 1000,000,000,000,00
Parārdha = 1000,000 000,000,000

This entire treatment leaves us in dark as to the exact value of Parārdha. There seems to be altogether independent interpretations of it. Not only are we unable to fix the place of Parārdha but we find it is equally difficult to

* Sankhyaparimāna p. 2

† Ibid p. 7, where it is said ' बालभूषणे चण्डेश्वर ' Is this the same Chandeśvara as the writer of the Ratnakaras ?

‡ Ibid pp. 2

know exactly what the terms denote after Prayuta upto which they all agree

Not finding myself any reasonable solution of the figure I have put it here as I found it in the various places, so that the attention of the scholars may be drawn towards this problem and a good solution arrived at